BOOK REVIEWS

A Popular History of the Reformation. (Philip Hughes). Joseph G. Bailey 325

Um die Reform und Einheit der Kirche: Zum Leben und Werk Georg Witzels. (Winfried Trusen). William S. Barron, Jr. 326

Ambrosius Catharinus Politus O. Pr.: Apologia pro veritate catholicae et apostolicae fidei ac doctrinae adversus impia ac valde pestifera Martini Lutheri dogmata (1520). (Edited by Josef Schweitzer). William S. Barron, Jr. 326

L'hypothèse libérale en Belgique. Documents inédits, 1839-1907. (Edited by A. Simon). Joseph N. Moody 328

Kulturkampf. Staat und Katholische Kirche in Mitteleuropa von der Säkularisation bis zum Abschluss des Preussischen Kulturkampfes. (Georg Franz). John K. Zeender 330

Destin du Catholicisme français, 1926-1956. (Adrien Dansette). Carlton J. H. Hayes 333

Halcyon Days: Story of St. Francis Seminary Milwaukee, 1856-1956. (Peter Leo Johnson). Patrick H. Ahern 335

Diccionario de historia de España desde sus origines hasta el fin del reinado de Alfonso XIII. Two volumes. (Revista de Occidente). Aloysius K. Ziegler 336

Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education. (Donald Lemon Clark). Berard Marthaler 337

The Gothic Cathedral. Origins of Gothic Architecture and the Medieval Concept of Order. (Otto von Simson). John Shapley 339

A Royal Impostor. King Sverre of Norway. (G. M. Gathorne-Hardy). Gerald A. Kinsella 340

The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation. (E. Harris Harbison). Walter W. J. Wilkinson 342

The Emperor Charles the Fifth. (Royall Tyler). George C. A. Boehrer 343

Studies in Social History. (A Tribute to G. M. Trevleyan). (Edited by J. H. Plumb). John M. Lamb 344

Bismarck, Gladstone, and the Concert of Europe. (W. N. Medlicott). William O. Shanahan 345

Coventry Patmore. (E. J. Oliver). Georgiana P. McEntee 346

The Cultural Life of the American Colonies, 1607-1763. (Louis B. Wright). David H. Burton 348

Errand into the Wilderness. (Perry Miller). Sister Joan de Lourdes Leonard 349

Background to Glory: the Life of George Rogers Clark. (John Bakeless). Peter J. Rahill 350

The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume 13. (Edited by Julian P. Boyd). Gilbert L. Oddo 351

Profiles in Courage (John F. Kennedy). John Rickards Betts 352

The Nation's Advocate, Henry Marie Brackenridge and Young America. (William F. Keller). Donald P. Gavin 353

The German-Language Press in America. (Carl Wittke). Benjamin J. Blied 354

A History of American Magazines, 1885-1905. (Frank Luther Mott). Eugene P. Willging 357

Magazines in the Twentieth Century. (Theodore Peterson). Eugene P. Willging 357

A History of Chicago. Volume III, *The Rise of a Modern City, 1871-1893.* (Bessie Louise Pierce). Paul Kiniery 358

Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power. (Howard K. Beale). John T. Farrell 360

Communism in Latin America. (Robert J. Alexander). Fredrick B. Pike 362

The Catholic Historical Review

Vol. XLIII OCTOBER, 1957 No. 3

THE PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION AND THE ANTI-MAYNOOTH AGITATION OF 1845

By

Gilbert A. Cahill*

George F. E. Rudé's recent article on the Gordon Riots of 1780 has demonstrated the role played by the Protestant Association in the riots and the efficacy of the "No Popery" cry in arousing the rioters to violence.[1] What has been overlooked in nineteenth-century British historiography is that the Ultra-Tories within Sir Robert Peel's Conservative Party reactivated the Protestant Association in 1835, and between 1835-1841 successfully used the "No Popery" cry to harass the Melbourne ministry. In 1845 the Protestant Association turned the emotional force of the "No Popery" cry against Sir Robert Peel when he attempted to carry the grant for St. Patrick's College at Maynooth. The result was that Sir Robert Peel split his Conservative Party in 1845 for the second time, one year before the repeal of the Corn Laws.[2] Most accounts of the anti-Maynooth agitation are fragmentary. Elie Halévy has dispensed with Maynooth in slightly over one page. There is some mention of it in Spencer

* Mr. Cahill is assistant professor of history in Harpur College.

The research for this article was made possible by a grant from the Ford Foundation for the academic year 1951-1952.

[1] George F. E. Rudé, "The Gordon Riots: A Study of the Rioters and Their Victims," *Royal Historical Transactions*, Fifth Series, VI (1955), 93-114.

[2] Gilbert A. Cahill, "Irish Catholicism and English Toryism," *Review of Politics*, XIX (January, 1957), 62-76. The first split in the Tory Party took place on the Catholic Emancipation issue.

Walpole's *A History of England,* in John Morley's *Life of Gladstone* and in Monypenny and Buckle's *Life of Benjamin Disraeli.* However, in these accounts there is little indication of how and why the mass protest came into being.[3] The nature of the agitation is of importance, for it says much about the assumptions of British nationalism in the period after the Reform Bill and it had its bearing upon a number of by-elections in 1845 and the general election of 1847.

The story of the anti-Maynooth agitation can be pieced together from the periodical press, the *Times* and the *Illustrated London News,* as well as from A. S. Thelwall's *Proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference of 1845.* The latter, a report of the struggle in which Protestants of all denominations engaged in opposition to the endowment of the Romish college at Maynooth, is most complete, for it is an eyewitness account given by a member of the Protestant Association's committee, which was active in setting the machinery of the agitation in motion.[4]

The rapid deterioration of Peel's reputation, the universal outburst of public opinion against his Maynooth Bill, and the split in the Conservative Party are all reflected in the periodicals and newspapers of 1845. The *Times* proclaimed that if Peel was right the nation was wrong, and he was attacked by all sections of the press. His former friends in the "No Popery" agitation of 1835-1841 viewed his action as betrayal; the liberal press condemned him for having appealed to bigotry during 1835-1841; the Evangelicals, the Irish Protestant party, and the Irish Catholic party opposed him in and outside of Parliament. Half of his party steadily debated and voted against him in Parliament.[5] *Punch* felt that Peel's measure was unpopular, for it

[3] Elie Halévy, *The Age of Peel and Cobden* (New York, 1948), IV, 80-81; Spencer Walpole, *A History of England* (London, 1890), V, 117-126; John Morley, *Life of Gladstone* (London, 1904), I, 270-281; William F. Monypenny, *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli* (New York, 1913-1920), II, 322-330.

[4] Algernon S. Thelwall, *Proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference* (London, 1845).

[5] *Punch,* VIII (1845), 149, 182; *North British Review,* III (May, 1845), 241-249; *Quarterly Review,* LXXV (June, 1845), 247-258; *Fraser's Magazine,* XXXI (February, 1845), 248-250; (March, 1845), 368-370; (April, 1845), 493-496; (May, 1845), 629; *Illustrated London News,* April 26, May 17, 24, 1845; *Times,* February 1, 3, 7, April 3, 4, 15, 17, 19, 21, 25, 26, May 5, 6, 1845. The Irish Catholic party opposed Peel because of his "Godless Colleges" bill of 1845.

had been introduced by the party which "had inflamed religious prejudices for years, so that the remembrance of such phrases as 'surpliced Ruffian' and 'demon priesthood' still rankled." *Punch* continued that no measure in the parliamentary session of 1845 produced more excitement in the public mind than the grant to Maynooth. The debates in the lower and upper houses of Parliament were paralleled by public meetings which opposed the grant. At all elections, "it was made the test of fitness for the candidate."[6] Peel's uncomfortable position was captured by *Punch* in the following lines:

How wonderful is Peel
He changeth with the Time
Turning and twisting like an eel
Ascending through the slime
He gives whatever they want
To those who ask with Zeal
He yields the Maynooth Grant
To the clamour for Repeal

He has baffled our every hope
He's surely in league with the Pope
We thought him the friend of the Church
He is leaving her now in the lurch
I'll bet that he shortly obtains
A cardinal's hat for his pains,
To punishment let us denounce him
Will nobody venture to trounce him?[7]

There can be no doubt that the split in Sir Robert Peel's Conservative Party was a historical fact by 1845.[8] The anti-Maynooth agitation is testimony to the historian that in the age of the railroad, religious sentiments and feelings continued to color politics and to influence political strategy. Nor was Maynooth to be the last instance of this "Papophobia." Within six years another notable outburst of "No Popery" occurred on the occasion of the "so called" papal aggression; and at this time, the fuse to the agitation was lit by the Liberal, Lord John Russell.

[6] *Punch*, VIII (1845), 149, 182, 191.
[7] *Ibid.*, 182, 191.
[8] Thelwall, *op. cit.*, p. 57; *Times*, April 7, 21, 26, May 23, 1845; *Fraser's Magazine*, XXXI (April, 1845), 493-496.

Actually the historical antecedents of the second split in Peel's party go back to the Tory reaction to the passage of Catholic Emancipation and the Reform Bill of 1832. The reaction took form and substance between 1835 and 1841, when there developed in Great Britain a revolution in political attitudes which explains the rejection of the liberalism of 1832 and the acceptance of Peel's conservatism by 1841. The strategy of the Conservative Party leaders was an important factor in this change of public opinion.[9] Also vital were the activities of the Orange Lodges, the Conservative Associations, the Evangelicals and the Protestant Association, the periodical press (including the religious press), and the daily newspapers, especially the influential *Times,* all of which employed the various aspects of the Irish question as their focal issue. During 1835 and the years which followed, the Protestant Association, whose leadership was substantially the same as that of the Orange Lodges[10] (the latter were declared illegal in 1836), was most active in bringing into being this conservative climate of opinion. This was possible because the objectives of the Protestant Association and the means it used to achieve these goals had much in common with those of the Evangelicals, the Conservative Associations, the Tory and Conservative periodical press, and the *Times.* During these years, the political tactics and strategy of the Protestant Association were perfected. The association's power came from its ability to structure issues, so that it both influenced and reflected public opinion.

The Protestant Association, which had been so active in the Gordon Riots, made its reappearance in 1835[11] and held annual meetings thereafter in which the nobility, members of Parliament, and influential clergymen participated.[12] Active in its work were such stalwart Evangelicals as the Reverend Hugh M'Neile of Liverpool and the Reverend R. H. M'Ghee of Dublin. The pamphlets and handbills of the organization were published by William Collins in Glasgow and R. B. Seeley in London. The association also had close contacts with *Blackwood's* and *Fraser's Magazines.* Among their pamphleteers

[9] *Blackwood's Magazine,* XXXVIII (July, 1835), 1-15.

[10] *Edinburgh Review,* CXXVI (January, 1836), 471-522; *National Club, Third Annual Report* (1848); *Proceedings of the Protestant Association, Tenth Annual Report* (May, 1846).

[11] *Times,* April 16, May 19, 1835.

[12] *Ibid.,* July 15, 27, 1836.

were D. M. Perceval whose pamphlets were influential in launching the anti-Maynooth agitation of 1845, A. G. Stapleton, the former secretary to George Canning, and J. C. Colquhoun, member of Parliament.[13]

The Protestant Association followed the same hierarchical pattern of centralization as the Orange Lodges. Much by way of research remains to be done on the association, but some conclusions can be drawn from the scattered items that the present writer has investigated. That the Protestant Association possessed a central executive committee is evident from the *Proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference of 1845.* In that year the central executive committee, composed of twenty-one members, included J. P. Plumptre, M.P., R. B. Seeley, Esq., the Reverend Baptist W. Noel, the Reverend A. S. Thelwall and the Reverend Charles Prest. The makeup of this committee is significant for it included a member of Parliament, the

[13] Norman Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel* (London, 1953), pp. xiv-xviii. In his introductory essay, Professor Gash states that in the twenty years following the accession of William IV "three features of the political system were outstanding: the oligarchic condition of the government, fundamentally administrative in outlook; the party system; moving towards a programme as well as a philosophy of action; and the external forces of public opinion, often genuine but also capable of being manipulated by men more adept and less scrupulous than the parliamentary leaders in the arts of mass propaganda" (p. ix). At another point he underlines the importance of public opinion as a factor in policy decisions and points up the consequences of the agitational activities of the Evangelicals and the significance of Catholicism and the Repeal of the Union as political issues (p. xviii).

The source which best illustrates the organizational strength of the Protestant Association is *Proceedings of the Protestant Association,* Tenth Annual Report (May, 1846). It is also interesting to note that the listed publications of the association by December 19, 1839, included twenty-seven pamphlets, eight handbills and several narrative tracts. Among these were: *Jezebel: Speech of the Rev. Hugh M'Neile at Market Drayton, Salop, The Speech of J. C. Colquhoun Esq. M. P. upon the Maynooth College Grant, England—the Fortress of Christianity* by the Rev. G. Croly, *A Sketch of Popery, A Few Facts to Awaken Protestants, The Jesuits Exposed, The Progress of Popery, Protestantism and Popery, The Popish College of Maynooth, Cruelties of Popery, Address to the Protestant Operatives of Great Britain, The Reformation, a Direct Gift of Divine Providence.* The association also published the *Protestant Magazine* and two narrative tracts—*Eleanor, the Irish Convert* and *Anecdotes of Our Protestant Martyrs.* Their handbills included *Popery, the Enemy of God and Man, Popery, Unchanged, Popery like Paganism, Startling Facts, Popish Bigotry, No Popery,* and *The Fifth of November.*

London publisher of the Protestant Association, and three very important clergymen.[14] The association also had its local branches with which the central executive committee was in correspondence. These local branches flourished in the rural parishes and especially in those urban areas of Great Britain which had a substantial Irish immigrant population. The London and Glasgow branches were particularly active. For example, the London Protestant Association with headquarters at Exeter Hall published fifteen tracts in 1837;[15] and the Glasgow Association published a series of twelve lectures on "Popery" delivered by clergymen to the Protestants of Glasgow.[16] The Protestant Association sought to get the support of the middle classes for conservatism by treating the Irish Question as a "Popery" issue, and it hoped to make significant numbers of Methodists and Dissenters antagonistic to "Popery" and secure their allegiance to conservatism. It was proposed to weaken liberalism as an ideology of change by bringing about conflict between its leaders and their nominal supporters, the Dissenters who constituted a large proportion of the newly enfranchised middle classes. By appealing to Methodists and Dissenters under the broad symbol of Protestantism, the Protestant Association waged a holy crusade against the Papists, who were considered as something less than Christian.[17]

[14] Thelwall, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

[15] *Popery in Ireland*, Tract xi, London Protestant Association. Other tracts of the London Protestant Association were *The Awful Quiet of the Romish Bishops of Ireland*, and *The Murderous Effects of the Confessional.*

[16] The twelve lectures of the Glasgow Protestant Association published by William Collins, 155 Ingram Street, included *The Rule of Faith—What Popery is—its Origin, Progress and Extent; Popery the Antichrist of Scriptures—Its character as developed and its doom as denounced in prophetic Scripture; Popery makes a God of the Priest and Slaves of the People; Popery the Enemy of Knowledge; Popery, the Enemy of Domestic and Social Affections; Popery, the Enemy of Public Morals; Popery, the Enemy of Freedom and the bane of National Prosperity; Popery, the Enemy of the Souls of Men*, and *The Formidable Character of Popery.*

[17] *National Club*, Third Annual Report (1847); *ibid.*, Circular I, "Address to the Protestants of the Empire"; *ibid.*, Circular IV, "Directions for the Formation of the National Assemblies"; *ibid.*, Circular VIII, "With What Classes of Dissenters the National Club is Ready to Cooperate"; *ibid.*, "Substance of a Speech of A. G. Stapleton, Esq. . . . on the Occasion of the Meeting of the Protestant Association of that Town Manchester" (April 29, 1847); *Blackwood's Magazine*, XLIV (1838), 506; XXXVIII (1835), 15; *British Critic*, XVIII (1835), 42, 249-250; XIX (1836), 237. For the Methodists and popery, cf. the *Times*, September 29, November 7, 16, 27, 1835.

In 1835 the celebration of the Protestant jubilee gave the leaders of the Protestant Association an opportunity to join with the Orange Lodges, the Evangelicals, and the *Times* in a campaign against "Popery." The Protestant jubilee, observed on October 4, 1835, commemorated the tercentenary of the introduction of the Protestant Bible into England. The goal of the celebration was that all sermons preached in all Protestant churches on that Sunday should be against "Popery" and its insidious evils. The Sunday of prayer was supported by the itinerant Evangelical preachers, the Reverend M. O'Sullivan and the Reverend Robert M'Ghee, who exhorted the nation to participate in this national, Protestant demonstration. Class divisions were forgotten as Dissenters and Methodists united with their Evangelical brethren in the support of Protestantism. The *Times* editorialized on the advantages to be derived from the observance of the jubilee. The publicity thus given to the affair energized groups and organizations already in existence and their activity as reported in the press led to the formation of other associations for the observance of the event.[18]

The Protestant jubilee had several important consequences. It provided the emotional occasion which coalesced a sporadic "No Popery" agitation into a representative movement. It was an appeal to British nationalism. The norm of acceptance was Protestantism. It was openly and violently against "Popery" and it ushered in a period of conflict with in-group and out-group patterns, capable of endless political, religious, and economic manipulation. The "Popish" stereotypes, legends, and myths, imbedded in British culture, were brought up-to-date. Irish "Popery" replaced the dreaded "Popery" of the sixteenth century with its Papists, Jesuits, political plots, and intrigues. Englishmen in the nineteenth century had their traditional and historical prejudgments, predispositions, biases, and beliefs nurtured by new villains, characters, slogans, and symbols—O'Connell, Popish priests and bishops, Maynooth, Peter Dens, and the Irish

[18] *Times*, September 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 22, 24, 26, 28, October 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, November 18, 20, 23, 26, 1835; *Blackwood's Magazine*, XXXVIII (July, 1835), 1-15. For an opposing point of view on this "no-Popery" campaign of the Protestant Association, *Times* and *Blackwood*, cf. the *Dublin Review*, II (December, 1836), 35-39, 45, 129-135, 159; (April, 1837), 330-336, 410-417, 499-537; *Tait's Magazine*, III (1835), 107-112, 326-333; *British Critic*, 4th Series, XVIII (October, 1835), 469-477; XIX (January, 1836), 227-238; *Edinburgh Review*, CXXVI (January, 1836), 471-522; *Spectator*, VIII (1835), 892.

Plot.[19] What started out as a religious demonstration was from the beginning used for political purposes.[20] The interstimulation of groups, newspapers, and periodicals carried through and past October 4, 1835. There was a reappearance of the agitation around November 5—Guy Fawkes Day. The occasion was expertly used by the Conservatives to produce a feeling of uncertainty, insecurity, crisis, and impending doom. The critical situation was traced to the Whig ministry's flirtation with O'Connell, "Popery," and Repeal. The "No Popery" feeling of the nation was used to produce a revulsion of opinion; the fear of "Popery" and the Whig alliance with "Popery" were employed to smear liberalism as well as Hume, the Radicals, Russell, Melbourne, and their Popish cabinet.[21]

By means of the Anti-Catholic campaign, the Conservatives were able to frustrate the Liberal threat to the House of Lords and for the next five years, the upper House, by its veto power kept the Irish problem in one form or another on the parliamentary agenda.[22] Between 1835 and 1841 the Irish problem revolved around three main issues—the Irish Church or tithe question, the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill, and Lord Stanley's Irish Registration Bill.[23] The discussion of these Irish issues enabled the Conservatives to continue their "No Popery" agitation. Explained to the reading public—not in terms of the complicated nature of the bills—but in terms of a trio of symbols, O'Connell, "Popery," and Repeal, the presentation of the Irish bills in this way aroused the nationalism of the British people. Repeated in this simplified fashion, these symbols continued

[19] *Dublin Review*, II (December, 1836), 129-135; *British Critic*, XVIII (July, 1835), 165; (October, 1835) 474-477; XIX (January, 1836), 232-239; *Times*, October 14, 15, 16, 1835—O'Connell; November 9, 10, 12, 18, 1835—"Popery"; November 12, 1835—Jesuits; November 4, 7, 1835—Priests. Peter Dens (1690-1775) was a Belgian theologian and the author of the theology textbook used at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Its contents were examined in detail prior to 1845, and again in that year in a series of pamphlets on the Maynooth grant.

[20] *Dublin Review*, II (December, 1836), 129-132; *Tait's Magazine*, III (1835), 111, 329; *British Critic*, XVIII (July, 1835), 42, 249-150; XIX (January, 1836), 237.

[21] *Times*, October 11, 23, 29, 1838; April 16, 25, 27, May 13, 17, June 1, 8, July 1, September 10, 14, 24, December 14, 1839.

[22] *Ibid.*, August 25, December 22, 1835; August 6, 9, 10, 30, 31, September 1, October 1, 5, December 8, 1836.

[23] *Ibid.*, April 1, 2, 4, 7, 1835—The Irish Church Question; January 8, April 10, July 28, 1835—The Irish Corporation Bill.

to discredit not only the Irish Catholic party, but the Whigs, Liberals, and Radicals who had joined O'Connell to effect the passage of these Irish measures.[24]

The Irish question gave the Protestant Association, the *Times*, and its numerous supporters a continued opportunity to refurbish the traditional master stereotype of "Popery" and to embellish it with a series of subsidiary myths and legends related to the nineteenth-century experience. In the repetitious discussion of the Irish question, the historical stereotype of "Popery" was related to current issues. E.g., the Irish Church Bill was represented as the first step in a plot to destroy the constitution, founded upon the twin pillars of Church and State; and the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill was featured as an attempt, through the extension of democracy, to destroy property, and as the first step in the development of a total anarchy, directed at the levelling of Church and State and all those institutions which protected Protestant liberty.[25] The Irish question likewise afforded the Conservative press a chance to dwell upon the subject of "Popery." Irish "Popery" was reduced to a series of symbols—O'Connell, a slavish peasantry, the Popish priests, Maynooth, Peter Dens, and Repeal. The story, repeated over and over again, was that O'Connell was in league with the Popish priests, educated at the Roman Catholic Seminary of Maynooth, where they were instructed in the theology of Peter Dens. The examination of the textbooks of Peter Dens furnished incontestable proof that Irish "Popery" was dedicated to the subversion of the constitution; this was to be accomplished by means of the insidious doctrine of Repeal of the Union.[26]

Complex issues thus became matters of black or white, for or against, Catholic or Protestant. By means of the association of symbols, organized pressure groups and the Conservative press were able to isolate the Melbourne ministry, as well as Liberals and

[24] *Ibid.*, February 11, 14, 17, 19, 24, 1835—"The O'Connell Legend"; June 15, 22, July 10, 11, 1835—"Maynooth"; July 6, 7, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 1835—"Dens Theology"; November 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 18, 1835—"Popery."

[25] For the campaign of the Protestant Association in 1836 against the Irish Church Bill and the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill cf. the reports on their meetings in the following issues of the *Times*, May 12, July 15, 21, 27, 30, August 3, 18, September 20, October 15, November 10, 28, 1836.

[26] For the activities of the Conservative Associations throughout the United Kingdom in the single year 1836 in the "no-Popery" campaign cf. the reports on their meetings in these issues of the *Times*—February 15, Finsbury Conserva-

Radicals, from the British public by representing them as actively allied with O'Connell. As the result of the fear of "Popery," individuals were more inclined to identify themselves with Conservatives rather than Whigs, Liberals, and Radicals at the polls. To keep alive this fear the assumptions and beliefs held concerning "Popery" were constantly re-enforced by repeated articles on the "Popish" threat. To this end, the starting point of an article could be some incident concerning an Irish priest or the Irish peasantry. The incident, once identified as an evidence of "Popery," constituted an opportunity to review the theology of Peter Dens, to make remarks about Maynooth, the confessional, O'Connell, and finally to condemn republicanism, the anarchic and jacobinical tendencies of radicalism, as well as the Popish acts of the Romish Melbourne faction.[27] The Protestant Association, with its Evangelical base, was influential in other ways. The Reverend E. Bickersteth's pamphlet on the "Progress of Popery," e.g., provided the inspiration for two articles in *Blackwood's Magazine* in 1838[28] and for an impassioned article on "Popery" in *Fraser's*

---

tive Association and West Surrey Conservative Association; April 14, City of London Conservative Association; April 16, Lewes Conservative Club; July 1, Croydon Conservative Association; July 4, South Bucks Conservative Association; July 13, West Surrey Conservative Dinner; August 26, North Chesire Conservative Association; September 10, South Lancashire Conservative Association; September 14, Grant Conservative Dinner at South Essex; September 15, West Suffolk Conservative Dinner; September 19, East Riding Conservative Festival; October 1, East Gloucestershire Conservative Association; October 3, Grant Conservative Dinner at Framingham, East Suffolk; October 5, Conservative Meeting at Caithness; October 7, Hereford Conservative Meeting; October 8, Grant Conservative Dinner at Northamptonshire; October 12, South Cheshire Conservative Association Dinner; October 17, Ripon Conservative Dinner; October 24, North Lancashire Conservative Association; October 24, East Worcestshire Conservative Association; October 27, Leeds Conservative Dinner and Essex Conservative Dinner; October 29, West Worcestshire Conservative Dinner; October 31, East Norfolk Conservative Association; November 3, Conservative Meeting at Halifax; November 19, Protestant Metropolitan Conservative Association; November 23, North Essex Conservative Association; November 25, Borough of Finsbury Conservative Association; December 3, Conservative Meeting in West Somersetshire; December 5, Conservative Meeting in Cornwall; December 14, Conservative Meeting at Liverpool; December 17, Conservative Meetings at Canterbury and Evesham; December 26, Conservative Meeting at Belfast; December 27, Conservative Meeting at Bath.

[27] *Ibid.*, July 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, September 9, October 19, 1835.

[28] *Blackwood's Magazine*, XLIV (October, 1838), 494-507; *ibid.*, XLIV (December, 1838), 730-740.

Magazine in 1839.[29] The latter was reprinted by the Reformation Society and enjoyed three editions, and editorials on these "Popery" articles were also current in the daily press.[30]

In an age when the social question was causing widespread concern, many members of the British working classes responded to the age-old sentiments of Protestant nationalism rather than to the theory of class conflict. The numerous Protestant Operatives Associations, which appeared in Great Britain after 1835,[31] were really branches of the Protestant Association.[32] It is of considerable interest that these operatives societies, most often found in those vicinities where Irish immigrants were most numerous and Orangeism strongest, played a part in the struggle, and contributed to propagandize working-class opinion. Their chaplains and guest speakers were drawn from the Protestant Association and the leaders of Exeter Hall. The work of Lord Kenyon, the Earl of Roden, the Reverend Hugh M'Neile, and the Reverend M'Ghee in this respect illustrates the close relationship of the clergy and the upper classes to the operatives and "lower orders." Following the publication of an article in the *Times* of June 19, 1835, describing the conservative temper of the working classes of Great Britain, a number of operatives associations were formed which inclined to Conservative and Protestant principles. The activities of these Protestant operatives societies can be followed in the columns of the *Times* during the years 1835-1840. In 1835, the Manchester Operatives Association appeared and within a period of three years operatives conservative associations were functioning in Blackburn, Worrington, Oldham, Leeds, Pudsey, Bolton, and Barnsley. At their annual meetings and banquets, O'Connell, Maynooth, the confessional, Peter Dens, and the evils of "Popery" were decried in language similar in tone and spirit to that used by the Orangemen, the Evangelicals, and the Protestant Association.[33]

It was small wonder then that Sir Robert Peel stirred a hornet's nest when he decided to carry his Maynooth grant in 1845. The fact that he attempted this is a tribute to his courage as a statesman, for by it he was declaring his independence of the old Tory section

[29] *Fraser's Magazine*, XIX (June 1839), 667-677.
[30] *Times*, October 26, November 21, December 15, 1838; February 11, 1839.
[31] *Ibid.*, September 1, 1835; January 22, April 27, November 14, 1836.
[32] *Proceedings of the Protestant Association*, Tenth Annual Report (1846).
[33] *Times*, September 20, November 15, 26, 1839; August 20, December 18, 1840.

of his Conservative Party. But more than this, this decision and the anti-Maynooth agitation which followed had consequences for British politics between 1845 and 1848.[34] On Tuesday, February 4, 1845, the Maynooth issue came before the attention of the British public. On this occasion, in answer to the speech from the throne, the Right Honorable William E. Gladstone, M.P. for Newark, announced that his resignation from office as President of the Board of Trade had taken place in consequence of measures proposed by the government in reference to St. Patrick's College at Maynooth. The issue was joined when Sir Robert Peel responded that his ministry intended to propose to Parliament "a liberal increase of the Vote for the College of Maynooth."[35]

The reaction of the British Protestants was swift and immediate. On February 6 the *Record* commenced a series of articles directed against the proposed grant. Arguing against any notion of an existing compact, the *Record* called for a general and widespread resistance and went on to explain how an effective out-of-doors opposition might be organized. The *Patriot* also carried several leading articles, while the *Watchman*, the medium of the Wesleyan Committee of Privileges, started a series of articles on the question. On February 8 when Dudley M. Perceval, a pamphleteer of the Protestant Association, published the first of his four letters in the *Morning Chronicle*, the Evangelicals took action against the ministry's proposed Maynooth grant.[36] Simultaneously the committee of the Protestant Association took action by appointing a standing committee of twenty-one members, who would meet every Tuesday and Friday "to concert and carry out plans for a more united and general opposition to the proposed increase of the Grant to Maynooth College." The committee made its first concrete proposal when it called for a public meeting "of Protestants of all Denominations" to be held at Exeter Hall on March 18. In the meantime the committee opened a correspondence "with many influential individuals who had previously distinguished themselves in the cause of Protestantism," and Mr. J. P. Plumptre, M.P., prepared an address to the Protestants of the United Kingdom

[34] Charles S. Parker, *Sir Robert Peel* (London, 1899), III, 334-356; *Times*, April 3, 1845.

[35] Thelwall, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8. Dudley M. Percevel, *Maynooth and the Jew Bill* (London, 1845).

which began—"To endow 'Popery' once more in a land that has been rescued from its yoke, is a madness little short of high treason against heaven."[37]

Meanwhile the Wesleyan Methodists became active. At a meeting in Nottingham 9,000 signatures were affixed to a petition against the Maynooth grant. And on March 11 an alliance of the Wesleyans and Evangelicals was effected when a letter of Sir Culling Eardley Smith, Bart., was forwarded to the committee of the Protestant Association by the Reverend E. Bickersteth. On March 11, Sir Culling Eardley Smith joined the standing committee of the Protestant Association and from that date the standing committee, now known as the Anti-Maynooth Committee, became most energetic. Its first release was a letter sent "to all the clergy and other ministers of Religion in the metropolis. The letter was also forwarded to the Editors of the *Patriot*, the *Record, Church and State Gazette* and the *Watchman*, with a request that they kindly notice it in their papers."[38]

Reverend Sir,—You are earnestly requested by the Committee opposing the increased Grant to Maynooth, to give notice of the Proposed Meeting to your Congregation on Sunday next, and to call upon them, as they reverence the word of God—as they dread the principles of "Popery"—and as they value their Christian and Protestant privileges and the true welfare of the country, to come forward at this national crisis—to attend the meeting, to make it generally known among their friends, and in every way to give their best support to the object which it has in view.

On behalf of the Committee

(Signed) George Finch
Culling Eardley Smith
Charles Prest

At the meeting held at Exeter Hall on Tuesday, March 18, Mr. J. P. Plumptre reminded the gathering of the importance of the crisis. A number of resolutions were moved against the proposed Maynooth grant, one of which called for the formation of the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee, which at its first meeting two days later adopted the following resolution "as the basis of union among Protestants of various Denominations in all their future proceedings."

[37] Thelwall, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

That while this committee is well aware that the particular grounds on which different bodies will found their petitions against the proposed Grant to Maynooth, may occasionally exhibit to a certain degree the diversities of sentiments that prevail amongst them; they are nevertheless convinced that in a cordial attachment to the Protestant Reformation, and a steadfast abhorrence of "Popery," there is a solid ground for union and cooperation in opposing the proposed measure; and they deem it of importance, under present conditions, to bear, with one another in regard to minor differences, while they cordially unite in one great object.[39]

At this meeting, it was disclosed to the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee that Sir Robert Peel meant to place the grant to Maynooth on a permanent basis. Upon receiving word of this decision, the committee went into action. It elected Sir Culling Eardley Smith its chairman and James Lord, secretary, moved its headquarters to the London Coffee House, and opened an extensive correspondence with various parts of the country. From its headquarters, "suitable circulars were issued; handbills were distributed and large posting bills were placarded in various parts of the metropolis, or carried around the streets, in order to awaken attention, or communicate information, as circumstances transpired."[40]

On March 28, 1845, several days before Sir Robert Peel presented his Maynooth Bill in Parliament, the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee sent to all parts of the country a circular petition by means of which members of Parliament were to be made aware of the feelings of the community. To arouse the Protestant sentiment of the nation, meetings were to be held against the ministry's proposed grant to Maynooth. Pressure was to be brought to bear upon the individual members of Parliament by the electors of the community. Protestants of all denominations throughout the nation were advised that it was

of immense importance that Protestant electors should use their personal influence, in the way of direct appeal to their own Representatives, whether Liberal or Conservative. Any considerable number of electors combining to assure their Representatives, that, if they vote for the Grant to Maynooth, it is highly probable that it will materially prejudice them at the next election, will insure such serious consideration as no Petition to Parliament would be likely to command.[41]

---

[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.
[40] *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.
[41] *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

The Central Anti-Maynooth Committee after March 28 met daily from nine in the morning until five in the evening, busying itself with the dissemination of information to advance the agitation against the proposed ministerial measure. In its drive against the government, no task, it seemed, was too small for the committee. E.g., it advised those individuals who would handle petitions that "petitions, not exceeding the weight of thirty-two ounces, and open at both ends may be forwarded by post, to any member of Parliament, free; and they may be prepared either on parchment or writing paper." To acquaint the nation with the nature and history of the Maynooth grant, the central committee issued the tract "Historical Statement Concerning Maynooth College," as well as recommended the distribution of a pamphlet "Maynooth, the Crown and the Country," written by Dr. D. C. Wordsworth.[42]

A statement by Lord John Russell (who was not above using the Irish Question for political purposes) on the Maynooth grant led the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee to believe that the grant was but a first step toward the endowment of the Catholic clergy and the Catholic Church in Ireland. Russell's advocacy of this proposition represented a decided departure from the "voluntary principle," and as a result many Methodists and Dissenters turned against him. Russell's observations, not disclaimed by Peel, had the effect of shifting the issue for the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee from the endowment of Maynooth to that of the endowment of "Popery," and the committee now claimed that the real question at issue was: "Protestants of England, are you prepared to pay for a Popish Establishment?"[43] The influential *Times* entered the anti-Maynooth agitation comparatively late. On April 3 it moved to oppose the prime minister, and thereafter it served as the focus of the anti-Maynooth agitation, constantly attacking Sir Robert Peel. It reported and supported the numerous meetings held throughout the nation in opposition to the Maynooth grant and its leading articles attacked Maynooth, the Irish bishops, and "Popery."[44]

Following the first division on Peel's Maynooth Bill, against which 114 votes were cast, the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee published a paid advertisement, which announced:

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 19.
[43] *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.
[44] *Times*, April 3, 4, 1845.

From the tenor of the debates last evening, and especially from the speech of Lord John Russell, it is evident, that leading Statesmen contemplate endowing the whole Romish Priesthood of Ireland should the present measure be successful. The Committee, therefore, earnestly entreat their friends, by congregational, parochial and municipal meetings, by Petitions to Parliament, by correspondence with their respective Representatives, by the free and intelligent use of the press, and by every other means of enlightening and influencing the public mind, to assist in calling forth and securing the most decided opposition to this unjust, unprincipled and dangerous measure.[45]

The committee felt that every effort should be made to rouse Protestants throughout the nation to "immediate action." Therefore, it printed a circular, whose purpose was to secure added time for the voice of the country to be heard. Conservatives as well as Liberals, Anglicans as well as Dissenters were to bring pressure upon their representatives in Parliament, and the circular reminded its readers that "England expects every man to do his duty." A finance subcommittee was formed which released a second circular to all having "at heart the honor and glory of God, the truth as it is in Jesus, and the safety of our beloved Constitution," calling upon them by their contributions to help in the contest against Sir Robert Peel's Maynooth grant.[46]

In response to this call for action a number of protest meetings were held throughout the country and numerous petitions descended upon Parliament.[47] To gain time for the voice of the nation to be heard, and to gain a postponement of the second reading of the Maynooth Bill, a deputation headed by Sir Culling Eardley Smith waited upon Peel and Russell.[48] On April 13 the Duke of Newcastle's first letter to the press in defense of Protestantism appeared in the *Times*.[49] During the week that the Maynooth measure was debated in Parliament, the Reverend Hugh M'Neile was active in Liverpool and petitions continued to pour into the House of Commons as public meetings were held throughout Great Britain.[50] On April 17 a reprint

[45] Thelwall, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
[46] *Ibid.*, pp. 27-29.
[47] *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.
[48] *Times*, April 11, 16, 1845.
[49] *Ibid.*, April 13, 1845.
[50] *Ibid.*, April 9, 1845, meetings at Finsbury and Liverpool; April 10, meeting at Bath; April 11, 15, 17, meetings at Northampton, Birmingham, Manchester, Bristol, and Leeds. *Illustrated London News*, April 12, 19, 1845.

from the *Journal des Débats* was carried in the *Times*, which revealed the great interest that foreign Catholics had in the Maynooth grant.[51] The presentation of the issue in the *Journal des Débats* made clear that the eyes of Catholics and Protestants elsewhere were focused upon the ministry's bill; the conclusion drawn was that the Protestant cause throughout the world was at stake. The result was that Bible societies, missionary societies, tract societies, previously not overly concerned with the Maynooth grant, now joined their efforts to the agitation. Despite the pressure exerted by the Protestants which, incidentally, was supported by many of the Irish Protestant members of Parliament, the Maynooth Bill passed its second reading with a majority of 147. The actual tally was 323 for and 176 against, of which 151 Conservatives voted for the bill and 148 Conservatives voted against it.[52]

Even before the second division on Maynooth had taken place the central committee was ready to expand its field of action. On April 16 it proclaimed that it was "highly desirable to summon Gentlemen from all parts of the Country, to hold a Public Meeting in London, and to give their personal assurance to the Government and to their respective Representatives, as to the opinions and feelings of their Fellow-Countrymen on the Maynooth Endowment Bill."[53] By paid advertisements, the news of the activities of the Central anti-Maynooth Committee was carried to the people.[54] On April 25 the Central Committee of the Protestant Association (the Central anti-Maynooth Committee) joined forces with the Wesleyan Methodists when members of the committee participated in a meeting held at city-road chapel.[55] And on Thursday, May 1, a militant religious élite from all sections of the United Kingdom gathered in Exeter Hall to protest against the endowment of "Popery." The meetings went on for five days and were reported in detail in the *Times*.[56]

The obvious purport of these meetings was to start a grass roots movement in defense of Protestantism. The organization and leader-

[51] *Times*, April 17, 21, 1845. *Illustrated London News*, April 26, 1845.
[52] Thelwall, *op. cit.*, p. 57.
[53] *Ibid.*, pp. 71-73.
[54] *Times*, April 17, 1845.
[55] *Ibid.*, April 29, 1845.
[56] *Ibid.*, May 1, 2, 5, 1845.

ship for such a movement was already in existence. To inject spirit into the agitation the committee brought together in a central place clergymen and important lay members of the communities throughout the country, so that the enthusiasm of the leaders might be communicated to others and plans might be made to unify and make the most of the Protestant effort. The tactics which had helped to unseat the Liberal ministry between 1835-1841 were now advocated against Peel's Conservative ministry in 1845. The leaders of the Protestant Association and allied groups notified statesmen that the present was not a temporary affair. They reminded their representatives in Parliament that they would agitate "if it were necessary for twenty years, till they saw in Parliament an entire change of tone. . . . Their fathers had attempted the first Reformation in this land under circumstances far greater than those now existing; and when truth was on their side . . . it was no chimerical opinion . . . they could effect on this point a second reformation, and secure a majority in the House of Commons based on Protestant Principles."[57]

In view of the popular reaction to the Maynooth grant, it can safely be said that the Orange Lodges before 1836 and the Protestant Association after 1836 were able to fix upon England their garrison psychology. The *Edinburgh Review* contended that Irish Orangeism was but a base from which to expand, for Orangemen realized that their "no-Popery" bias was exportable to both Great Britain and the empire.[58] Although the total number of Roman Catholics in England and Scotland was relatively small, the fear of "Popery" could be exploited by pointing to the strong concentration of the Irish in certain areas. Aware that an important ingredient of the British loyalty pattern was its anti-Catholic orientation, the Orangemen sought to elicit a reaction to Irish immigrants and to the alliance of the Whigs and O'Connell. In order that the Orange frame of reference and the Orange fear of Catholics and "Popery" would be accepted by a majority in the United Kingdom, Orangemen sought to convert much that was understandable in the British historical past into a xenophobic kind of nationalism.

The strength of the Protestant Association, like that of the Orange Lodges, derived from the very close connection between its religious and political activities. The leaders of the two organizations were

[57] *Ibid.*, May 2, 1845.
[58] *Edinburgh Review*, CXXVI (January, 1836), 471-522.

influential members of the Irish and English nobility, oftentimes large landholders in Ireland. Liberals maintained that politics were Orangeism's "real end and element." To achieve their ends, Orangemen banded together. To protect their social position and property, they appealed to Protestant ascendancy and maintained group solidarity by a "firm and fierce faith in the truth, and righteousness, and validity of their institution." In their search for psychological security, they aroused the religious passions of the multitude and "fomented hostile and intolerant feelings among co-sects of the christian religion." Liberals contended that by commemorating past party triumphs with annual processions, Orangemen embittered this conflict, exasperating "ancient feuds, which have frequently led to riots, with loss of life and property." Orangemen were all the things they imputed to the papists. The most vocal critics of O'Connell's Association and Rent, Orangemen would institute the same system they denied to O'Connell. They favored dividing England into districts "for the collection and transmission of contributions towards forming a National Protestant Fund." And yet these Orange lords —Roden, Lorton, and Ennis Killen—"cross their arms and thank their God they are not as other men are, rent collectors, association farmers, agitators, even as this O'Connell is."[59]

A study of the "no-Popery" movement of 1835-1841 reveals that conservatism derived much of its appeal from the fact that Conservative leaders linked their party ideology with British nationalism. Because of the close relationship between Protestantism and British nationalism, Conservative leaders, by treating the Irish question as a religious one, could capitalize upon the emotional complex which influenced the public mind. By presenting the Irish question in this way, they directed the patriotic sentiments and feelings of the nation in favor of the Conservatives and against the Whigs, Liberals, and Radicals. The attitudes invoked were essentially "against" or "negative" ones. The fact that a "no-Popery" campaign based upon the Irish issue brought unity to the various interests within the Conservative Party cannot be overemphasized if the emotional force of conservatism as an ideology is to be understood.

In a recent analysis of Conservative Party politics, Professor Norman Gash contends that Sir Robert Peel split his party because

[59] *Ibid.*

of his adherence to Conservative principle. His study presents conservatism as a rational ideology, inclined in the direction of liberalism. Peel is accepted as the fashioner of this conservatism, though not the organizing genius of the Conservative Party. Lesser men in the party are credited with the formation of the great maze of Conservative Associations which dotted the country after 1835. This view has merit because it calls attention to the valid distinction between ideology and political organization and points up the difference between the political theory and practice of the Conservatives. It also takes into consideration the close relationship between political ideology and political leadership, recognizing the fact that ideology brought Peel, as leader of the Conservative Party, into conflict with party organizations and party interests. Professor Gash, however, relates the split in the Conservative Party to repeal of the Corn Laws, overlooking the fact that the split had already taken place the previous year on the Maynooth grant.[60]

The conservatism of the 1830's and early 1840's has too often been identified with the moderate, rational, and, indeed, liberal statements of Peel's Tamworth Manifesto. It should not, however, be so simplified, for to do so divorces theory from practice, ideas from the issues, the interests, the groups, the political organizations, the political leaders, and the press, which forged these ideas into an activist ideology. From the start, there was a double aspect to conservatism, a positive or "for" part, which may be related to Peel's Tamworth Manifesto, and a negative or "against" side connected with the presentation of the Irish question as a "no-Popery" issue. Between 1835-1841, conservatism embodied both Peel's rational message and the emotional one of the Irish ultra-Protestant and Evangelical sections of the Conservative Party. At the level of practice, Conservatives in their ideological struggle with liberalism and radicalism relied most heavily upon the negative aspect of their ideology. The Conservative Associations, Protestant organizations, political leaders, and an influential part of the press joined forces to form an anti-Catholic opinion in Great Britain. In connection with the Irish question, they raised a "no-Popery" cry, thereby raising sentiments and emotions sanctioned by the historical, religious, and cultural experiences of the British nation.

[60] Norman Gash, "Peel and The Party System," *Royal Historical Transactions*, Fifth Series, I (1950), 47-69.

The fact that this campaign was an "anti" affair, directed against "Popery," Whiggery, liberalism, and radicalism concealed the diversity of objectives which motivated its sponsors. While all would agree on the use of the "no-Popery" message to break up the alliance of the Melbourne government with the Irish and Radicals, the long range goals of the proponents of the religious conflict situation were often contradictory. This can be confirmed from a review of the attitudes of Peel, the Protestant party, and the Conservative press to liberalism, to change, to the Irish question, and to the "no-Popery" cry.

During the period 1835-1841, Conservative political leaders, groups and organizations, newspapers and periodicals used similar methods to promote fear and panic. To increase the intensity of the "no-Popery" cry and its hold on the public imagination, the anti-Irish and anti-Catholic currents were fed by book reviews, tracts, pamphlets, and editorials. The propaganda techniques employed were also similar. These included the repetition of symbols, slogans, and charges against "Popery" without much regard for their validity and authenticity. Similarly, all made use of the same stereotypes and the same pattern of associations, e.g., O'Connell, the bishops, the priests, Maynooth, and Peter Dens' theology.[61] The popular reaction to this negative aspect of ideology was as important a factor in the victory of conservatism over liberalism by 1841, as was the message of the Tamworth Manifesto. At the party conflict level, the "no-Popery" cry was used successfully against radicalism and liberalism, for it called into play sentiments, values, and loyalties sufficiently strong to get numbers of Dissenters and Methodists to disavow liberalism. But pushed to its logical extreme, the "no-Popery" cry stood for no compromise and for Protestant ascendancy.

That the objectives of the many Conservatives who joined in the discussion of the Irish question were not the same, is revealed in a study of the literature of the "no-Popery" agitation. To Sir Robert Peel who maintained the Irish issue on the parliamentary agenda, practical constitutional and administrative considerations were of primary importance. Between 1835-1841 the discussion of the Irish question as a religious issue helped to terminate the conflict between

[61] *Dublin Review*, I (July, 1836), 506-548; II (December, 1836), 35-51, 129-168; (April, 1837), 330-336; 409-437.

the House of Commons and the House of Lords, which had started at the time of the Catholic Emancipation issue and had come to a climax during the Reform Bill agitation. However, while Peel operated at the parliamentary level, the nation received its information principally through the emotional message of the press, the interests, and organizations which employed the "no-Popery" cry. While Peel debated the Irish Church issue at the parliamentary level, the Evangelicals, the Protestant, and Conservative Associations, the Irish Orange faction, and the Conservative press interpreted it for the public. If we accept Peel as the "executive" leader of the Conservative Party, these other organizations and their directors were the "expressive" leaders, for they imparted the emotional and symbolic content to the Irish issue.

In his Tamworth Manifesto, Peel took a position in favor of moderate change. The point to notice, though an obvious one, is that he did not oppose change. Within Peel's party, however, there were those who accepted neither the spirit nor the message of the Tamworth Manifesto. Opposing both liberalism and radicalism, they made use of the "no-Popery" cry to forestall any change in the institutional arrangement. Moreover, they were the leaders who, because of the role they played between 1835-1841, acted as the intermediaries between Peel and the nation on the Irish issue.

It would appear, then, that the split within the Tory Party which resulted from Catholic Emancipation had not healed by 1841. In a way Peel's conservatism, as evidenced in the Tamworth Manifesto's acceptance of rational reform, was as much a political tactic as the formulation of a new ideology. While it inclined toward moderate liberalism, the "no-Popery" ideology of the Protestant and Evangelical sections of his party opposed change as well as liberalism. From its inception, therefore, Peel's Conservative Party contained two opposing factions, whose co-existence was obscured by the fact that the campaign of 1835-1841 was directed against "Popery." This ambivalence within conservatism as ideology was brought into the open in the discussion of the Irish question in 1845, in which year it split the Conservative Party on the Maynooth grant.

The leaders of the anti-Maynooth agitation in their attack upon Peel and his supporters maintained that at the hustings many members of the Conservative Party had appealed to their constituents with "Church and State" and "no-Popery" slogans. By their favor-

able vote on the Maynooth grant these individuals had broken faith with their constituencies. The tie between member of Parliament and constituency, therefore, was ideological, and for this breach of creed, in future elections these wronged constituents would seek revenge and deliverance from their present representatives. The Protestant Association, proceeding through the provincial machinery established at the anti-Maynooth Conference, proposed to make voting behavior the test of strength at future by-elections, and in the general election of 1847 would seek to return a Protestant Parliament to govern England.

In this campaign, the Protestant Association was aided by *Fraser's Magazine*, *Blackwood's Magazine*, and the *Times*. Commenting upon the first division on the Maynooth Bill, the Whigs, the *Times* remarked, "dragged along Sir Robert Peel and half of his supporters."[62] On the second division, Peel was able to get the support of 165 Radicals and Whigs, while only 158 Conservatives voted for his measure. If the decision had been left in the hands of the Conservatives, the *Times* continued, "the motion would have been negatived by a majority of 18."[63] On April 26 the *Times* played the spotlight of publicity upon those members who refused to take a definite stand on Maynooth. In this analysis and later editorials, it helped to stir up misgivings between members of Parliament and their constituencies. When the split in the Conservative Party held through the third reading with 150 Conservatives voting for and 152 against it, the *Times* pointed out that Peel was in the minority of his own party, and since the Conservative house was "exactly divided against itself," it must soon fall. The *Times* charged that Peel for many years had worked with the Conservatives who went to the hustings with the cry of "Church and State" and "No Surrender." Thus he had cultivated a "good no-Popery interest, of which he took care to maintain the control in his own hands. He had parted with it for certain important considerations to Lord John Russell and Mr. Daniel O'Connell."[64]

Paralleling the struggle between Peel and his party was the conflict between the members of Parliament and their constituencies. Exeter Hall took advantage of this situation by issuing 30,000 copies

[62] *Times*, April 7, 1845.
[63] *Ibid.*, April 21, 1845.
[64] *Ibid.*, May 23, 1845.

of a circular which, according to Mr. M'Geachy, M.P., was also distributed to the members of the House of Commons. The circular reminded certain members of the House that at their election they had pledged to oppose the Maynooth grant and that their Maynooth vote would be an issue at the next general election. Protestant deputations informed their representatives, whether Whig or Conservative, of the intensity and general prevalence among their constituents of a conscientious feeling against the endowment of "Popery."[65] When the Reverend Hugh M'Neile of the Protestant Association entered into controversy with Lord Sandon and with Mr. Roebuck concerning their votes on the Maynooth grant, he gave to the nation an example of how individual Protestants might bring pressure to bear upon members of the House of Commons. Mr. Edward Baines, Jr., of Leeds advised Protestant leaders in borough and county constituencies to follow the lead of M'Neile.[66]

On May 29, 1845, the *Times* announced that the third division on Maynooth had raised "a storm of indignation among the Conservative constituencies of Ulster," which the Newry *Telegraph* helped to direct against those members who had been miscreant on Maynooth. The *Telegraph* advised Lord Castlereagh to be prepared "to take farewell of Down at the next election and to consider the lieutenancy of the county as ample recompense for loss of friends and shipwreck of public character." It denounced Mr. Ker of Downpatrick and Captain Maynell of Lisburn as "skullers," and Messrs. Henry Tennent, John Young, and the Right Honorable Henry Corry as "salaried hangers-on of the Government." Sir Arthur Brook and Sir Edmund Hayes were accused of betraying their constituents by their absence at the third reading of the Maynooth Bill. Mr. Irving of Antrim and Lord Claude Hamilton, "the quasi Orange representative for Tyrone," were reminded that "when the day of reckoning comes, as ere long it will, the Protestant constituents will avenge themselves on those who have treated with contempt sympathies and prejudices which they formerly resorted to for party purposes, when a personal object was to be attained."[67] In Middlesex certain constituents of Colonel T. Wood lodged a protest to clear themselves of

[65] "Speech on Maynooth" (1845). This was a speech by Mr. M'Geachey circulated in pamphlet form.

[66] *Times*, May 20, 1845.

[67] *Ibid.*, May 29, 1845.

"all participation in an act, which must . . . implicate this nation in the guilt of promoting a system as contradictory to the word of God as it is injurious to the good of men."[68]

Because of the oft-repeated contention that the vote in Parliament on the Maynooth grant did not reflect public feeling, it was commonly accepted that Maynooth would be an issue in the ensuing by-elections and in the forthcoming general election. During the anti-Maynooth agitation two by-elections took place, those for West Kent and Greenock. Their results proved to the defenders of the Protestant constitution that they still had a viable cry in "no-Popery" and "no-Surrender." In the West Kent election the issue was Maynooth and the objection to it, the *Times* maintained, was daily increasing in intensity. In the Greenock election Mr. Baine, who favored the grant to Maynooth, defeated Mr. Dunlop, who opposed it, by the slight majority of six (350-344). The contest turned upon the Maynooth question and toward the close of the poll a feeling of intense excitement pervaded the town. According to the *Times*, "Mr. Dunlop polled ten more votes during the last half hour than Mr. Baine and although he (Dunlop) only came forward as a candidate on Monday afternoon, notwithstanding the great local personal influence of his opponent, it will be observed he was very nearly beating him."[69]

At Woodstock the Marquis of Blandford was compelled to resign his seat because of his decision to support the ministry on Maynooth against the contrary desire of his noble parent. Mr. Loftus who replaced him appealed to the electors on the basis of his principles which were "firmly fixed in Church and State" and opposed "to the Grant to Maynooth and everything adverse to the Protestant Church." At the Leominster election, Mr. Whalley contended that the Maynooth grant, once effected, would last forever and at Peebleshire Mr. Mackenzie, although returned without a contest, was under attack because of his Maynooth vote.[70]

On May 12, 1845, Sir Francis Egerton resigned his seat for South Lancashire and the cause for retirement was in part due to his pro-Maynooth position. At his resignation he announced that since the first discussion of the measure he had frequently received

[68] *Ibid.*, April 14, 1845.
[69] *Ibid.*, April 17, 21, 1845.
[70] *Ibid.*, April 28, May 8, 1845.

"communications from individual members of the electoral body" deprecatory of the course he had followed.[71] At the election for the County of Edinburgh Sir John Hope, one of the candidates, had questions put to him by a Mr. Marshall. The latter, employing the techniques of the Protestant Association and the anti-Maynooth Conference, asked: "Do you or do you not approve of the grant to the Catholic College of Maynooth? Are you or are you not a friend to exclusive legislation?" When he received no answer Marshall turned to the crowd and asked: " 'Is such a man as that a proper representative for this county?' Loud cries of 'No — No' mingled with a slight hiss." In the Belfast election, Lord Chicester campaigned as a staunch Protestant, "Conservative only being used in Belfast as a term of reproach."[72]

At Dartmouth early in July Mr. Prinsep was defeated by Mr. Moffat. Commenting upon the election the *Times* observed that until the last moment "the partisans of Mr. Prinsep were so confident of success that they now seem totally unable to explain the cause of his failure. From the cries on the hustings and the admission of the Conservatives themselves, there can be no doubt that the Maynooth grant was one cause of Mr. Prinsep's defeat."[73] At the Exeter election the Protestant Committee of Electors stated that as an indispensable requirement for its support the Conservative member should state explicitly his sentiments "not only with regard to the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland for the future, but . . . on that question as affected by past measures."[74] In subsequent by-elections at West Suffolk, Abingdon, Cambridge, and Southwark the Maynooth grant was emotionally debated.[75]

In July, 1845, the Leicester *Journal* reported that within the last few days several important elections had been held throughout the country. The lesson which they carried to the prime minister and to the nation was one which would not be forgotten when the next general election took place. The issue as well as the verdict of the elections was the judgment of the nation "upon modern ministerial

[71] *Ibid.*, May 12, 1845.
[72] *Ibid.*, June 6, 12, 1845.
[73] *Ibid.*, July 4, 5, 1845.
[74] *Ibid.*, July 5, 7, 8, 9, 1845.
[75] *Ibid.*, West Suffolk, July 7, 8; Abingdon, July 5, 7, 8; Cambridge, July 7, 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, 1845; Southwark, August 18, 19, 21, 23 and September 11, 1845.

tergiversation." The elections indicated the full extent of the public's reaction to the political perversion of Peel who had fully forsaken Conservative principles to follow the Whig creed. Peel's descent to liberalism was termed complete. He was now said to be openly emulous of "Lord John Russell as a free trader" and of Lord Melbourne who had boasted it was his intention to strike "a heavy vote and great discouragement to Protestantism in Ireland."[76]

By 1845 the Protestant wing of the Conservative Party was advocating the acceptance of public opinion as the guide to legislation. Threatened by a crystallizing opinion on the Corn Law issue, it sought to maintain its position by getting the support of the public on the Maynooth issue. It would make the most of the emotionalism attached to the Maynooth betrayal in order to block free trade. The danger, however, was that Peel's isolation on Maynooth would send him searching for a counter-issue to take to the public, and that he would find it in the repeal of the Corn Laws for which a considerable support existed.

The Protestant section of the Conservative Party, therefore, interpreted the elections as a rebuke to Peel for his apostacy. They fought to isolate him from the public and to minimize the effect of the split within Conservative ranks by rallying the Protestant and landed interest against Peel. Protestantism viewed as opposition to "Popery" was to continue to be the bulwark against economic liberalism. Realizing the importance of attack and the necessity of a scapegoat for party solidarity, the Protestant faction levelled the charge of apostacy against Peel. In fact, they accused him of a double betrayal, that of the agricultural interest and that of Protestantism. With regard to agriculture Peel, it was said, had taken "the reins of government to support the agricultural interest, which by the Whigs had been despoiled . . . and he has carried out the very policy, which, by his election to office, the country had condemned. . . . He has coquetted with the manufacturers . . . has turned his back upon the agriculturists so that the agriculturists in disgust exclaim the former open enemy was better than the covert one." In such circumstances "every conservative director of public opinion" must speak plainly and forcibly, not as the advocate of party, but in the name of "something higher —the exercise of principle in that party." Let it be openly proclaimed,

[76] *Ibid.*, July 14, 1845, a reprint from the Leicester *Journal*.

the Leicester *Journal* continued, "that we are conservative not therefore absolutely ministerial—we are Protestant but not therefore necessarily the tamperers with Romanism."[77]

The Protestant faction seceded from Sir Robert Peel's party some months before the Irish famine precipitated the issue of Corn Law repeal. The formal act of secession took place on June 17, 1845, when the Protestant party withdrew from the Carlton Club, establishing the National Club with its headquarters at the Old Palace Yard, Westminster. The formation of the National Club was announced to the Protestants of Great Britain in the columns of the *Times* on June 23, 1845, when the Earl of Winchelsea proclaimed that a National Club had been formed in London "in support of the Protestant principles of the Constitution." And he encouraged British Protestants "to lose no time in establishing similar clubs in every county and every borough throughout the United Kingdom."[78]

Sir Digby Mackworth was the moving spirit behind the National Club and its completion opposite the Houses of Parliament was the result of the untiring work of its trustees, viz., Sir Digby Mackworth, Mr. Frewen, Mr. Tollemache, and Mr. Paul. These members, a spokesman for the club proclaimed, had brought into existence in twelve months what it had taken the Carlton Club and the Reform Club years to achieve. The National Club was to be "a rallying place, where men of like minds might meet, concert their plans, agree how to act, and how to influence local associations throughout the United Kingdom."[79]

The names of the members of the general committee of the National Club indicate the close connection between the Irish landed interest and the Protestant Association. Eighteen members of its general committee sat in the House of Commons and among its members were the Duke of Manchester and the Earl of Winchelsea; Viscounts Lorton and O'Neill; Lords Southampton and Kenyon; and the Earls of Cavan, Egmont, Mountcashel, and Roden. The latter was an important member of the Irish Protestant party and with Lord Kenyon, and Sir William Verner, M.P., had been a leading officer of the Orange lodges. Kenyon and the Earl of Roden also had con-

[77] *Ibid.*, July 14 and August 16, 1845.

[78] *Ibid.*, June 23, 1845.

[79] *National Club*, "Substance of The Speech of J. C. Colquhoun Esq., M.P., at the Opening Dinner of the National Club."

siderable influence in education and Bible societies while J. C. Colquhoun, A. G. Stapleton, and Dudley M. Perceval were outstanding pamphleteers. The efforts of the Earl of Winchelsea and Dudley M. Perceval in launching the anti-Maynooth agitation have already been discussed.[80]

Between August 14, 1846, and September 21, 1847, the National Club held meetings and printed twenty circulars.[81] These circulars, generally four to five pages in length and written in a forceful manner, stressed the need for a spiritual regeneration which was to be carried into politics. Peel's thinking on Maynooth was depicted to be as foreign as "the principle of the French Revolution, espoused by Liberalism and advocated by Popery." An open appeal was made to Dissenters and Protestant operatives to put aside their religious divisions and to join forces with the National Club in electing a Protestant Parliament at the general election.

During 1846 and 1847 the Protestant Association was well organized to attempt to carry through its demand for a Protestant Parliament, and it accepted the resolutions of the anti-Maynooth Conference as the basis for its "no-Popery" campaign. Numerous pamphlets and circulars were released to make known its goals to the Protestants of the United Kingdom. Its executive leaders were those of the National Club.[82] It had some one hundred provincial committees through which the central committee raised funds and kept in contact with all parts of the country. Many individuals who wrote pamphlets for the association and who addressed public meetings were members of provincial committees, among whom were such skilled veteran politico-religious agitators as the Reverends E. Nangle of Achill, Ireland, R. M'Ghee of Dublin, Mortimer O'Sullivan of

[80] *Ibid.*, Third Annual Report, 1848.

[81] *Ibid.*, *Statement of Principles*, August 14, 1846; *On the Dangers to Which Our Protestant Institutions are Exposed*, September 1, 1846; *How Best to Overcome These Dangers*, September 15, 1846; *Directions for the Formation of Local Assemblies*, September 29, 1846; *To Avoid Liberalism and to Hold to Truth*, October 6, 1846; *Reasons against Giving the Roman Catholic Priesthood Pay and Power*, October 27, 1846; *Difference between A Romish Priest and An English Clergyman; With What Classes of Dissenters the National Club is Ready to Cooperate; Justification of the Establishment of the National Club; On the Results of the General Election of 1847*, September 21, 1847.

[82] *Proceedings of the Protestant Association*, Tenth Annual Report (1846); *National Club*, Third Annual Report (1848).

Killyman, Ireland, Robert Buchanan of Glasgow, Hugh M'Neile of Liverpool, Hugh Stowell of Manchester, and R. Bellamy of Hereford.[83]

At the local level, the *Proceedings of the Protestant Association* listed fifty-four local Protestant Associations, with their secretaries and their office of residence. Among the secretaries were twenty-three clergymen. The fact that the offices of the local associations were often rectory addresses suggests that church pulpits throughout the United Kingdom were centers of political agitation. It also enumerated twenty-three Protestant Operatives' Associations, sixteen of whose secretaries were laymen. The other seven names were not listed. The Operatives' Associations were in Irish cities and those cities in England where Irish immigrants had settled.[84]

On May 13, 1847, the Protestant Association held its annual meeting at which J. P. Plumptre, M.P., announced it was the duty of the association in the coming elections to induce "Protestant gentlemen to come forward as candidates throughout the country." The association proposed to show there could be no true alliance between "Popery" and liberalism, and in the final resolution of the evening the Reverend H. M'Neile moved "that at this crisis it is more especially the bounden duty of every elector to exercise the elective franchise as a solemn and sacred trust reposed in him for the glory of God and his country." He charged that the Jesuits were out to penetrate the legislative system. To counteract these Popish plans, Protestant operatives were carrying on a door-to-door campaign to reconcile differences between adherents of opposing political holdings, "Whigs, Tories, Free Traders and Protectionists." As the result of the Protestant influence in those boroughs where the contest might be close, the Protestant Association hoped to return thirty or forty additional Protestant members to Parliament who would oppose a ministry inclined to "Popery."[85]

[83] *Proceedings of the Protestant Association.*

[84] *Ibid.*

[85] *Times,* May 13, 1847. On this occasion M'Neile asked the individual voter to take the following pledge: "I, A.B., do solemnly promise at the next election, I will give my vote in favor of any Parliamentary candidate pledging himself to resist the endowment of Popery and all its advances and its claims, in preference to any candidate whatsoever who will not give such a pledge, and that I will not forego this my word for any private interest or at the solicitation of any party whatever."

In light of the anti-Maynooth agitation the results of the by-elections of 1845 and the activities of the National Club and the Protestant Association, Elie Halévy's account of the general election of 1847 is obviously incomplete. Halévy noted, with which point there is no quarrel, a sizable increase in the representation of the business interests, especially the railroad interests. He was on less solid ground when he attributed the large turnover of parliamentary members in this general election to the fact that many retired from political life as the natural consequence of long years of parliamentary service.[86] The relatively large turnover of parliamentary members was in part a consequence of two political events of the previous years, Maynooth in 1845 and the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. The weakness of Halévy's interpretation of the general election of 1847 stems from the fact that he emphasized the repeal of the Corn Laws and passed over the significance of the split in the Conservative Party on the Maynooth issue.[87]

It would be unfair to say that Halévy lacked insight with regard to the Irish question, for he, as clearly as any historian, was keenly aware of the political implications of "Popery." He realized that the Tories and Conservatives relied heavily upon it for public support, and he pointed out that prior to 1829 the ultra-Tories used it to secure the support of the British public.[88] He called attention to the anti-Popery bias of the High Church movement and the "no-Popery" orientation of the Methodist-Evangelical alliance.[89] If Halévy is to be criticized, it is because he did not sufficiently apply his hypotheses to the political developments of the 1830's and 1840's. He missed the significance of the feud between the Evangelicals and the Tractarians which developed at the time of the Protestant Jubilee in 1835,[90] and he accepted the message of Peel's Tamworth Manifesto of 1835, overlooking his second Tamworth Manifesto of 1847. He neglected to relate the "no-Popery" attitudes generated by the heated discussion of the Irish problem to conservatism as ideology. He omitted a discussion of the close connection between the many

[86] Halévy, *op. cit.*, IV, 155-161.
[87] *Ibid.*, IV, 80-81, 88-129.
[88] *Ibid.*, I, 165,415.
[89] *Ibid.*, *De la crise du Reform Bill à l'avènement de Sir Robert Peel*, III (Paris, 1923), 136-155.
[90] *British Critic*, XVIII (October, 1835), 477; XIX (January, 1936), 235.

pressure groups of the Irish Protestant faction and the Conservative Party. His lack of emphasis upon the "no-Popery" crusade of 1835-1841 foreshadowed his brief discussion of Maynooth, presented in slightly over one page.[91] The result is that despite Halévy's recognition of the importance of the "no-Popery" sentiment, and despite his postulation of the Methodist-Evangelical alliance, his work displays a certain lack of balance. His presentation of the period around the great man theory accounts in part for his interpretation of the election of 1847. To the British electors of 1847 Peel was somewhere between the hero that Halévy makes of him and the villain depicted by *Punch*, the *Times*, *Fraser's Magazine*, and *Blackwood's Magazine* in 1845.[92]

The issues in the general election of 1847 were exceedingly complex due to the fragmentation of parties and the fact that the Maynooth grant and the Corn Law repeal had split the Conservative Party along both religious and economic lines. Moreover, all the important political leaders, Peel, Bentinck, and Russell, carried the taint of having trafficked with "Popery." The election is difficult to analyze because two of the important issues, "Popery" and "Corn Law Repeal" were often intertwined with local matters. Peelites might do well in liberal constituencies because of their vote on the repeal of the Corn Laws; on the other hand, Mr. Macaulay and Mr. Roebuck might do badly in nominally radical constituencies because, by their Maynooth vote, they had disavowed the "voluntary principle."[93]

In the campaign of 1847 Peel issued his second Tamworth Manifesto in which he defended his Maynooth policy as well as the repeal of the Corn Laws.[94] The *Quarterly Review*, acting as the spokesman for the Bentinck-Disraeli section of the Conservatives, disregarded "Popery" as an issue and concentrated on Peel's betrayal of the landed interest. Since Lord George Bentinck stood for the acceptance of the principle of religious toleration, the *Quarterly* made protection the issue and

[91] Halévy, *op. cit.*, IV, 80-81.

[92] *Blackwood's Magazine*, LVII (May, 1845), 647, 648; *Fraser's Magazine*, XXXI (February, 1845), 248-250; (March, 1845), 368-370; (April, 1845), 493-496; XXXII (August, 1845), 240-252; *Punch*, VIII (1845), 149, 182, 191; *Times*, April 3, 4, 15, 17, 19, 21, 1845.

[93] *Ibid.*, May 26, 28, 29, July 29, 30, 1847—Roebuck Election; August 2, 1847—Macaulay election.

[94] *Fraser's Magazine* XXXVI (August, 1847), 241-248.

promoted party unity by attempting to establish Peel as the scapegoat of their campaign.[95] The Protestant faction within the Conservatives, operating through the Protestant Association and the National Club, sought by means of the "no-Popery" cry to return a Protestant parliament. They were opposed to Peel because of Maynooth, and lukewarm to Bentinck. The picture was further complicated by Peelites standing in liberal constituencies and by Dissenters voting against Liberals and Radicals because of their negligence of the "voluntary principle."[96]

The "no-Popery" cry was raised in a number of contests. In the election at Bath, at which Roebuck was opposed by Lord Ashley, Ireland was the usual "battlefield of English politics." The placards of his opponents accused Roebuck of being "an infidel opposed to every maxim and in every way to the sacred dogma of religion." In defeating Roebuck, Ashley's followers campaigned from door to door, using the technique advocated by the Protestant Association. That religious feeling decided the election is indicated by the remarks of Roebuck who said "he was defeated not by bribery but by bigotry . . . the result of the religious prejudice aroused . . . by an agreement between the Tories and a section of the Liberal Association."[97]

The liberal as well as the conservative press noted that the Irish question was discussed at the hustings, often in religious terms. The *Illustrated London News* remarked "that so indispensable to the electoral mind is something to be alarmed and indignant about, that a terror has been created where none exists; the phantom of the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church is the phantom of the hustings, the more terrible because like Milton's Death, it has neither shape, form or being."[98] When Gladstone and Cardwell announced that they would stand for Oxford, two contemporary journals immediately "sounded the anti-Popery tocsin against both candidates."[99]

[95] *Quarterly Review*, LXXXI (June, 1847), 309-315, 578.

[96] *British Quarterly Review*, II (August, 1845), 104, 127-130; *Report of the Proceedings of the Protestant Dissenters' Anti Maynooth Conference* (London, 1845); *Times*, August 2, 1847.

[97] *Ibid.*, May 26, 28, 29; July 29, 30, 1847.

[98] *Illustrated London News*, July 24, 1847.

[99] *Times*, May 17, 19, 29; July 24, 29, 1847. At this election one observer remarked, "Exeter Hall chooses a candidate with the stature of a pigmy and then brings all opponents down to his level."

From the few instances mentioned above there can be little doubt of the considerable influence of the religious question in the election of 1847. The *Illustrated London News* complained of candidates at the hustings, drawn from the business interests, who deported themselves like schoolmen of old by their disputations on theological matters.[100] *Fraser's* contended that it was the aim of Protestants "that party will become an apotheosis and Faction . . . be transformed into Patriotism."[101] The *North British Review* recalled that the Negroes in the plantations had a saying: "If the negro was not a negro, the Irishman would be a negro."[102]

The most succinct statement of the relationship between religion and the general election of 1847 appeared in a letter to the *Times* in which the writer stated that professions by candidates at the hustings were made "in the spirit of purest hypocricy." He lamented the fact that the electors of Britain centered "all religion in a horror of Maynooth, a dread of paying priests in Ireland," and he concluded that the electors had returned to Parliament a group of men "who on the hustings are 'sincere' Protestants and yet somehow play a covetous role in every day life." The letter concluded:

> The constituencies of England are showing an amount of religious zeal really quite edifying. The whole country has put on the appearance of a vast pro-Protestant anti-Papal League. The solicitors who manage the purchase of the borough seats are forced to cram their candidates with a sort of theological catechism, in which they are taught where and what Maynooth is and the awful sin of contributing to it. Further, from the same source they learn how to proclaim in proper hustings language their attachment to religious truth as held pure and undefiled from any Romish adulteration, by all true Protestants; their utter abhorrence of the idea of endowing the Romanist priesthood of Ireland.[103]

It should be noted that the National Club and the Protestant Association, despite their appeal to the "no-Popery" cry, failed to elect a Protestant parliament.[104] This was so because by 1847 the key political leaders—Sir Robert Peel, Lord George Bentinck, and Lord

[100] *Illustrated London News*, July 24, 1847.
[101] *Fraser's Magazine*, XXXV (June, 1847), 5.
[102] *North British Review*, VII (1847), 538.
[103] *Times*, August 3, 1847.
[104] *National Club*, "On the Results of the General Election of 1847," September 21, 1847.

John Russell—were favorable to the principle of religious toleration; because many of the candidates, who were willing to go along with the religious bias of their constituencies to get elected, were not in practice rabid religionists; and, perhaps most important, because the press during the general election saw fit to play down the "no-Popery" issue. It is of interest, however, that while critical of the "no-Popery" cry, the press did not take a favorable attitude toward Ireland, but merely changed its basic criticism from an anti-Popery note to an anti-Irish one. In 1847-1848, as Great Britain reacted to the growth of nationalism in Ireland, British religious sentiments were merged with racial, cultural, and national attitudes.[105]

Remarkable, too, was the alteration as to the classes of society from which the members of Parliament were drawn. The *Quarterly Review* noted that the election had returned "a greater number of railway directors, engineers, and contractors; a greater number of barristers; a greater number of merchants; a greater number of retail traders; a greater number of writers and lecturers; a smaller number of naval and military men, a smaller number of persons connected with noble families and a smaller number of country gentlemen."[106] Equally notable was the fact that at a time when neither Peel, nor Bentinck, nor Russell was in a position to exert strong political leadership because of the fragmentation of parties, the average Englishman in the constituencies had supported a conglomeration of "Protectionists, Free Traders, Whigs, Radicals and Conservatives" who had at the hustings united, as the *Times* remarked, "in expressing their devotion to the pure religion held by the majority of Englishmen, their determination to preserve it from even the least Romish taint."[107]

[105] *Times*, January 30, February 2, 6, 10, 25, March 8, 9, 10, 19, April 10, 14, 16, 1847; *Blackwood's Magazine*, LXI (April, 1847), 517-524.

[106] *Quarterly Review*, LXXXI (September, 1847), 541.

[107] August 3, 1947. A letter to the *Times* concluded that the concentration upon "Popery" prevented other important questions from being discussed, such as: Is a labourer worthy of the price of his hire—should he not earn a sufficiency of food for the sweat of his brow? Is it scriptural to foster a state of things which engenders impurity of mind and then to pass laws against bastardy? Is it scriptural to keep wages by combination so low that the labourer is ever half a pauper and then to treat pauperism as if it were a crime? Does the pure Protestant faith condemn England's peasantry to be crowded in hovels where both sexes seek rest in an atmosphere as impure as the circumstances under which they breathe it?

The "no-Popery" movement of 1835-1841 and the anti-Maynooth agitation of 1845-1847 are storehouses of information for the study of the assumptions and dynamics of British nationalism during the period of the hungry 1830's and 1840's. The emotional feeling of this nationalism mitigated class divisions inherent in the social question and engendered a psychological unity among the English people. This was especially important when in 1848, a few months after the general election, England was called upon to face the revolution in France, the threat of subversion in Ireland, and the renewed activity of Chartism. At this time the House of Commons, composed of members who had appealed to the "no-Popery" cry only recently at the hustings, experienced solidarity with their constituencies as a patriotic press met the crisis, by associating Irish repeal, French republicanism, a liberal Pope, Irish Popery, and democratic Chartism. The year 1848, often claimed as the year of triumph for liberalism, actually witnessed the bankruptcy of that ideology, in the face of threats from abroad and at home. In that year British nationalism, taking its anti-Irish orientation from the ultra-Tory ideology, won a signal victory when the Tory "cry," despite the fact that it was handicapped by a disunited party, was powerful enough to help mitigate class divisions in England, to crush the Irish rebellion, to estrange Chartism from national support, and to insulate England from the sparks of the revolution in France.

Harpur College

ANTICIPATING THE DEATH OF PIUS IX IN 1861[1]

By

Lynn M. Case*

In 1860 Italy had become united except for Rome and Venetia. In the process of the unification movement the pope had lost to the new kingdom in this same year of 1860 his provinces of the Romagna, Umbria, and the Marches. Consequently in 1861 there were two irreconcilable claims raised: the new Italy demanded Rome as its capital, and the pope not only refused to surrender Rome—which was guarded by a French garrison—but demanded the return of his three lost provinces. In 1861 there were three approaches to a solution of this Roman Question: 1) Italian-Vatican negotiations on a Rome compromise, 2) Franco-Italian negotiations on preserving the *status quo* and withdrawing the French garrison, and 3) Franco-Italian negotiations on influencing the election to obtain a liberal pope in case of the death of Pius IX. These three approaches were being followed somewhat simultaneously, but the present study is limited to the third—Franco-Italian plans to influence the election of a future pope—and Pius IX's apparent countermeasures.

Pius IX had been subject to spells of epilepsy since he was sixteen years old,[2] and on the morning of Tuesday, April 2, 1861, he seemed to have had another rather severe seizure during services in the

* Mr. Case is professor of European history in the University of Pennsylvania.

[1] This article is based upon a paper presented at the Conference on French History in New York City on February 1, 1957. The author wishes to acknowledge with deep gratitude the financial aid of the American Philosophical Society and the University of Pennsylvania in the collection of material for this study. He also is grateful for the kind services of the staffs of the French Archives du Ministère des Affaires étrangères, the French Archives Nationales (Collections privées et Microfilms), the British Public Record Office, and the Austrian Haus-, Hof-, und Staatsarchiv, as well as the generous co-operation of the Thouvenel family and the Duke of Gramont.

[2] F. Hayward, *Le dernier siècle de la Rome pontificale* (Paris, 1928), II, 219. Gramont, the French ambassador in Rome, said: ". . . le pape approche de soixante-dix ans, il est gros et replet, soumis depuis longtemps aux atteintes d'une maladie de forme épileptique et par conséquent exposé à des crises dont on ne peut prévoir les suites" (Gramont to Thouvenel, Rome, April 20, 1861, L. Thouvenel, *Le secret de l'Empereur* [Paris, 1889], II, 65).

Sistine Chapel.[3] The news of the pope's illness arrived in Paris and Turin at about the same time (April 9),[4] and Cavour in Turin immediately began to think about Franco-Italian concerted action on the choice of a new pontiff.

I think [he wrote Vimercati, his representative in Paris] it would be wise right now to start thinking about what should be done in case of a conclave so as to be ready to act at once in such a contingency. As we'd have to settle a lot of details, it would seem to me [advisable] to talk to some one fully informed about men and things. For this purpose I suggest sending Pantaleoni to Paris. His trip would cause no suspicion, because he would appear to be on his way to England where he goes frequently to visit his English wife's relatives and his numerous clients up there.[5] He would bring with him a plan for discussion. At the same time he would furnish the most minute details on the state of the negotiations [in Rome].[6]

Vimercati saw Thouvenel, the French foreign minister, on April 12,[7] and two days later the latter informed Gramont, the French ambassador in Rome, that "a great deal is being said here about the pope's health." He continued, "Tell me what you think about it and whether you think there is need to consider the matter of a choice of a future successor."[8] Gramont's reply told of the pope's good recovery but warned of his advanced age, poor physical condition, and susceptibility to further seizures. On the question of a future election he remarked:

[3] Descriptions of this illness of Pius IX are found in Gramont to Thouvenel, Rome, April 2, 1861, Thouvenel, *Secret*, II, 30, 34; same to same, Rome, April 6, 1861, Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, Paris, MSS, Correspondance politique [hereafter referred to as AMAE, CP], Rome, 1017: 132, no. 31.

[4] On the French government's receipt of the news of Pius IX's illness cf. Vimercati to Cavour, Paris, April 10, 1861, *La questione romana negli anni 1860-1861. Carteggio del Conte di Cavour con D. Pantaleoni, C. Passaglia, e. O. Vimercati* (Bologna, 1929), II, 131, no. 374.

[5] Diomède Pantaleoni was the doctor who had been conducting Cavour's negotiations in Rome with the former Jesuit, Father Carlo Passaglia.

[6] Cavour to Vimercati, April 10, 1861, *ibid.*, p. 133, no. 375.

[7] "Hier au soir j'ai vu l'Empereur. Je pars ce soir pour Turin . . ." (Vimercati to Cavour, telegram, Paris, April 13, 1861, *Documenti diplomatici italiani* [published by the Ministero degli Affari Esteri, Commissione per la Pubblicazione dei Documenti Diplomatici] [Rome, 1952] [hereafter cited as DDI], Ser. 1, Vol. I [edited by Walter Maturi], 91, no. 56).

[8] Thouvenel to Gramont, Paris, April 14, 1861, Thouvenel, *Secret*, II, 58.

It would be very difficult, when the occasion should arise, to say which cardinal should be our choice, or at least in favor of which we should exert our influence. There are really only two parties to consider in the Sacred College: the Jesuit party and the non-Jesuit party. All our efforts should combine to have the pope emerge from the second category, and, if this result is achieved, the major part of our difficulty will be overcome. Among the cardinals, the one nearest us and showing the most practical and conciliatory attitude is incontestably Cardinal d'Andrea. He is indeed the only one who has the courage of his convictions and who is not afraid to show which side he favors.[9]

When the prospects of Pius IX's death began to interfere with the conclusion of the Franco-Italian evacuation treaty, Thouvenel and the Emperor Napoleon III both urged the visit of Pantaleoni and wanted him to bring a biographical sketch of each of the cardinals in Rome.[10] Cavour's instructions to Pantaleoni also included a plan to have the cardinals change the oath of the future pope so that he would not be bound to insist on the temporal power or the restitution of the lost papal territories. When it came to agreeing on the future pope, Cavour wanted Pantaleoni to suggest Cardinals Santucci and Bofondi.[11] Cavour was going to have Pantaleoni pretend that his little son became ill as a pretext for remaining in Paris.[12]

Dr. Pantaleoni arrived in Paris on May 12 and remained until June 10. It may be hoped that his son did not have to pretend such a prolonged illness! We do not need to linger long on this Pantaleoni mission. He did have several conferences with Thouvenel and left him a report on the cardinals.[13] What is more pertinent to the question of a conclave is that Pantaleoni's talkativeness was bound to reveal to those about him the purpose of his mission and thus to alert the Holy See to the possibility of a Franco-Italian plan to influence the future conclave. The loquacious doctor not only talked to Thouvenel on many irrelevant subjects,[14] but he spoke with all sorts of people whose curiosity must have led them to take advantage

[9] Gramont to Thouvenel, Rome, April 20, 1861, *ibid.*, pp. 65-66.

[10] Vimercati to Cavour, Paris, April 24, 1861, *Questione romana*, II, 154, no. 404.

[11] Cavour instructions to Pantaleoni, May 7, 1861, *ibid.*, pp. 186-187, no. 433.

[12] Cavour to Vimercati, Turin, May 9, 1861, *ibid.*, p. 187, no. 434.

[13] Vimercati to Cavour, Paris, June 1, 1861, *DDI*, 2nd ser., I, 153, no. 118.

[14] Pantaleoni to Cavour, Paris, May 19, 1861, *Questione romana*, II, 205-213, no. 451.

of his weakness, e.g., such people as Prince Napoleon, Dr. Conneau, a close friend of Napoleon III and the Italian cause, Thiers and several other Orleanists and Legitimists of the opposition, Lord Cowley, the English ambassador, Sir John Acton, members of the staffs of the Orleanist *Journal des Débats* and *Revue des deux mondes*, and Monseigneur Deguerry, the new Bishop of Marseilles. Pantaleoni even sent his confidential reports to Cavour through the British minister in Turin, Hudson, by way of the British courier.[15] On the day after he had seen Cowley, the latter wrote Russell: "M. Thouvenel has not been very communicative with me lately on affairs in Italy, and it is rather by others that I have been made aware of the efforts that he has been making lately. . . ."[16] Likewise, Vimercati, the Italian agent in Paris, was very worried on learning of Pantaleoni's conversation with Bishop Deguerry. He remarked to Cavour: "He talked with him [the bishop] in a way that it would have been better not to have done, and which certainly will be known in Rome by now."[17] There was another possible leak of information to Rome, from the French foreign ministry itself. About a week after Pantaleoni's departure from Paris, Gramont wrote Thouvenel from Rome:

> Please do not forget that in affairs concerning Rome there are people even in your department who consider indiscretions permitted to a certain degree and in certain cases which would be repulsive to them in other circumstances. There are even some who may think they have to do it for conscience' sake.[18]

Thus it seems most likely that the papal government was informed of Franco-Italian plans to influence the future conclave, even though we do not yet have evidence of this knowledge from Vatican correspondence.[19] It is also quite possible that Archbishop Sacconi,

[15] Same to same, Paris, May 23, 1861, *ibid.*, pp. 224-228, no. 461.

[16] Cowley to Russell, Paris, May 20, 1861, Public Record Office, London, MSS, Foreign Office (hereinafter cited as PRO, FO), ser. 27 (France), vol. 1391, no. 758.

[17] Vimercati to Cavour, Paris, June 1, 1861, *DDI*, 1st ser., I, 153, no. 118.

[18] Gramont to Thouvenel, Rome, June 18, 1861, AMAE, Mémoires et documents (hereafter cited as AMAE, MD), Papiers Thouvenel, X, 143-44. This passage was omitted from the version published in L. Thouvenel, *Secret*, II, 148.

[19] There is no indication of knowledge of these efforts in the Vatican correspondence reproduced by Father Pietro Pirri, S.J., in his work, *Pio Nono e*

the papal nuncio in Paris, may have informed Antonelli, the Cardinal Secretary of State, through private correspondence.

At just about the time that Pius IX may have learned of the Franco-Italian plans to provide for his successor, he had another epileptic attack on June 6,[20] and on the following day, while he was still keeping to his bed, the Holy Father learned of the death of Cavour. In spite of his hostility to Cavour, the pontiff was only further upset by such news. Gramont reported:

> The most eminent people in both camps [in Rome] bitterly regret it [Cavour's death] because they have all been in agreement for some time in considering Count Cavour as the moderator of extreme opinions and the anticipated negotiator of future transactions. The cardinal secretary of state [Antonelli] appears to see in this catastrophe the signal of a revolutionary and anarchical crisis whose consequences could be fatal to Italy.[21]

Under these critical circumstances it would not have been surprising if Pius IX had done something to foil the plans for the election of his successor, and it seems as if this is just what he may have tried to do. At least we know this: that on or about June 16 —ten days after the pope's most recent attack and six days after Pantaleoni's departure from Paris—Cardinal d'Andrea came to Gramont with very serious and very confidential news. He related that Pius IX had sent a papal brief to certain cardinals in Rome, ordering them in case of his death to hold a quick meeting to elect his successor without waiting for the arrival of the absent cardinals from various countries. Pius IX had said he was motivated by the critical situation, but it was clear that the purpose had been to prevent liberal cardinals under French or other influences from electing a liberal successor, i.e., one who would agree to a diminution of the temporal power.[22] The seriousness with which Gramont received this news is reflected in his letter to Thouvenel:

Vittorio Emmanuele II dal loro carteggio privato. La questione romana, 1856-1864 [*Miscellanea historicae pontificiae*, Vol. XVI] (2 v. Rome, 1951).

[20] Gramont to Thouvenel, private letter, Rome, June 7, 1861, Thouvenel, *Secret*, II, 132-133; same to same, Rome, June 8, 1861, AMAE, CP, Rome, 1017: 302-303, no. 46.

[21] Same to same, Rome, June 8, AMAE, CP, Rome, 1017: 302-303, no. 46.

[22] Cf. in text of Gramont draft reproduced below.

I call your full attention to the very grave dispatch that I am writing you by this courier under the classification of *very confidential*. I beg you earnestly to keep it secret because if they ever learn of our countermeasures, the latter will be completely undone. . . . As for me I am *sure* of *those* who know about this affair, and they are Cadore and de Piennes. [The italics are Gramont's.]

The cardinal who gave me this information is Cardinal d'Andrea who is very devoted to us and the only one in the Sacred College who is not afraid to say so. [23]

It is quite probable that there had been no earlier leak of this information or else Gramont would have learned of it through his usually good channels of information and would not have been so surprised. Likewise, for at least two days after the d'Andrea visit Gramont was still sure that only three people knew of the brief outside the Sacred College. If it had been a general rumor, his informants would have picked up the news elsewhere, and he would have mentioned it in his letter to Thouvenel on June 18.

In the meantime Gramont had thought out his countermeasure and proceeded to put it into effect. He wrote out a draft of a letter to be sent to the College of Cardinals as soon as the pope should die, informing the cardinals of what France would do if they tried to hold a quick and secret election. It is evident that the note was drawn up in Gramont's office because it is in the same handwriting as the clerk who copied his official dispatches. As a matter of fact, the knowledge of the alleged papal brief remained a secret until the first week in July. On July 9, Bach, the Austrian ambassador in Rome, reported:

I believe I should mention a rumor which has gone the rounds in Rome in the last few days. . . . It involves a brief that the Holy Father is said to have addressed to the members of the Sacred College after his last illness to recommend to them to hurry and choose his successor in case of his death. He is supposed to have told them not to wait for the foreign cardi-

---

[23] Gramont to Thouvenel, private, Rome, June 18, 1861, AMAE, MD, Papiers Thouvenel, X, 143-44. This letter, as published in L. Thouvenel, *Secret*, II, 148, did not contain these two paragraphs. Louis Thouvenel probably used the copy in Gramont's private papers, where these two paragraphs were marked with blue pencil by either the Duke of Gramont or by Louis Thouvenel himself (Archives Nationales, Paris, Collections privées, Microfilms, Archives Gramont [hereafter cited as AN, Arch. Gramont], ser. E, 35: 234).

nals but to proceed with the election even before the assembling of a conclave so as to avoid as much as possible the pressure that certain powers would undoubtedly try to exercise. And it is also said that Pius IX designated three members of the Sacred College—Cardinals De Angelis, Barnabò, and Patrizi—as those among whom he desires his successor to be chosen.[24]

Since the rumor by that time was all over town, Bach did not try to keep it a secret, but rather went straight to Cardinal Antonelli for an explanation. The papal Secretary of State replied that he knew absolutely nothing about the existence of such a document. When Pius IX was in exile in Gaeta in 1849, Antonelli admitted, His Holiness had written up some communication to the cardinals for action in case of his death, but that had been placed in the archives and had never been used. He did not state what this older document contained, but he went on to say that it would be unwise for a pope to designate certain members of the Sacred College as his successor or call an illegal election because it would give a pretext for some powers to challenge the validity of the election. Bach had the impression that Antonelli would be much opposed to such a procedure.[25]

In the face of such conflicting evidence and the fact that the Vatican Archives are still closed for this period, it is difficult to determine whether the papal brief was ever sent. That Pius IX had written a similar one in the earlier crisis of 1849 and was to issue three bulls and a set of rules between 1871 and 1878, which revised the traditional regulations governing conclaves,[26] makes it seem plausible that he may have modified and issued the old brief or issued an entirely new one in 1861 in view of the schemes for electoral interference. He may have sent it to only a few of the cardinals in Rome, deliberately avoiding Antonelli, as he was to do with other papal letters. If d'Andrea was not one of the recipient cardinals, he may have obtained information from some other cardinal or from someone in the pope's inner circle. D'Andrea did not mention any papal preferences for the succession, and this element of Bach's report may very well have been the usual embroidery that goes with spreading

[24] Bach to Rechberg, Rome, July 9, 1861, Haus-, Hof-, und Staatsarchiv, Vienna, MSS, Politisches Archiv (hereafter cited as HHSA, PA), Rome Vatican, 1861, XI, 203, no. 19c.

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* III, pt. I (1923), 716-717.

rumors. There is also the possibility that Antonelli, in his diplomatic position, felt he had to give a diplomatic denial of something which had actually happened much to his regret.

Whether there really was such a papal brief or not, Gramont was thoroughly convinced of its existence and sent his draft countermeasure to Thouvenel for his approval in the same courier of June 18. A few days later he forwarded some suggested changes that, as he said, "I thought I ought to submit to you for the eventual note to the cardinals in case of a conclave."[27] At no time did Gramont mention public rumors of the brief, but the news probably did not leak out until after his departure for his vacation in Paris early in July.

In the meantime Thouvenel in Paris had received Gramont's reports about the brief and a copy of Gramont's draft threat. These must have arrived on about June 22, and Gramont's suggested changes probably arrived on June 26.[28] On June 27, Thouvenel had a long conference with the emperor at Fontainebleau on this draft threat to the cardinals. They went over its wording and modified it at many points; from the evidence, Thouvenel may also have revised the revisions after his return to Paris. At least when he arrived at his office in Paris the next morning, he sent the following telegram to Gramont: "The emperor gives his complete approbation to the idea developed in your dispatch of June 18 and to your *original* draft note [Thouvenel's italics], except for a few changes which I will indicate by the next courier."[29]

Among the Rouher Papers in the Foreign Ministry Archives is Gramont's original draft with the corrections in Thouvenel's handwriting, corrections presumably made in consultation with the emperor. Here is the proposed note with the deletions and additions:[30]

[27] Gramont to Thouvenel, private autograph, Rome, June 22, 1861, AMAE, MD, Papiers Thouvenel, X, 147; also a copy in AN, Arch. Gramont, ser. E, 35: 236-237. The version as published in L. Thouvenel, *Secret*, II, 150-152, omitted this passage.

[28] It usually took from four to five days for dispatches to go between Rome and Paris. An official dispatch, sent at the same time as Gramont's private letter of June 22, arrived in Paris on June 26 (AMAE, CP, Rome, 1017: 353).

[29] Thouvenel to Gramont, Paris, June 28, 1861, 10:40 a.m., teleg., AMAE, CP, Rome, 1017: 368.

[30] "s.d. [1860?] Projet de note à remettre par le ministre [*sic*] de France à Rome au cardinal secrétaire d'État en cas de mort du pape Pie IX—minute" (AMAE, MD, Papiers Rouher, Italie, II, Affaires romaines, no. 4). The above-quoted heading was found in the table of contents of the same volume. The date of final composition, of course, is not 1860 but June 28, 1861, as

Italics—to indicate deletions.
Bold face—to indicate insertions.

Rome, le . . .

[Note in pencil in Thouvenel's hand: "M. Viennot[31] Prière de faire une copie de cette pièce en tenant compte des corrections."]

Aussi longtemps qu'il a plu à la Divine Providence de maintenir sur le trône de St. Pierre Sa Sainteté le Pape Pie IX d'Auguste et respectable mémoire et de le conserver *au dévouement et* à la vénération des Fidèles, le gouvernement de l'Empereur s'est fait un devoir d'assurer la sécurité et l'indépendence du Souverain Pontife par la présence d'une armée à Rome et dans une partie du territoire de l'Église.

Aujourd'hui que par suite du malheureux événement qui vient de frapper le monde Catholique le pouvoir apostolique réside jusqu'à l'élection d'un nouveau Pape dans l'ensemble du Sacré collège, *Sa Majesté l'Empereur des Français s'inspirant toujours des mêmes sentiments de dévouement et de respect filial envers l'Église, continuera à entourer le St. Siège de ces mêmes garanties de sécurité et d'indépendence.* **Sa Majesté l'Empereur des Français s'inspire toujours des mêmes sentiments de dévouement et de respect filial envers l'Église.**

Son armée conservera toutes les positions qu'elle a occupées jusqu'à ce jour, l' L'ordre et la tranquillité maintenus par *ses* **les soins** *de son armée de son armée de l'armée française* **de son armée** permettr*aient***ont donc** à tous les cardinaux individuellement et au Sacré Collège collectivement de procéder sans crainte, sans trouble, en pleine liberté et en pleine confiance au gouvernement intérimaire de l'Église et à l'accomplissement du mandat électoral qui leur est déféré par les sacrés Canons. [The next sentence below was struck out and then restored. Thouvenel's note in the margin reads: "Paragraphe à rétablir."] Le Sous-signé Ambassadeur Extraordinaire et Plénipotentiaire de Sa Majesté l'Empereur, agissant au nom de Son Auguste Souverain, en donne à Votre Éminence, ainsi qu'au Sacré Collège l'assurance formelle.

Cependant il est parvenue à la connaissance du Sousigné que certains membres du Sacré Collège possédent [*sic*][32] un bref de Sa Sainteté Pie IX, par lequel cet Auguste Pontife dérogeant aux traditions de la Sainte Église et aux canons

---

ascertained above; but the final copy of the document bore no date, since it was to be used in a future contingency.

The story of the wanderings of this document is also interesting. Thouvenel evidently put this draft among his private papers and, before his death, transferred most of his private papers to his close friend and colleague, Eugène Rouher. In the year 1870 the Germans captured Rouher's and Thouvenel's papers at the chateau of Cerçay. These Cerçay Papers were retained in Berlin until 1919, when they were returned to the French foreign ministry by a requirement of the Treaty of Versailles. Those in the archives of the French foreign ministry who separated the Thouvenel Papers from those of Rouher seem to have decided to leave this document with the "Papiers Rouher" because it was a draft without any Thouvenel signature.

[31] M. Viennot was chief clerk in Thouvenel's office.

[32] Corrected by Viennot in final copy sent to Rome (AMAE, CP, Rome, 1021: 492-495).

en vigeur pour l'élection des Papes, autorise et ordonne que vue les circonstances critiques, périlleuses et exceptionnelles de l'époque actuelle, il soit procédé immédiatement à l'élection de son successeur à la Chaire de St. Pierre sans attendre, pour la convocation des Cardinaux et la réunion du Conclave, les délais prescrits par la loi et consacrés par la tradition.

La déclaration qui précède suffirait amplement à démontrer combien les motifs qui servent de prétexte à ce Bref Pontifical sont peu fondés en realité. Jamais, en effet, le Sacré Collège n'a possédé pour la liberté de ses actes, la sécurité de ses membres et le calme de ses délibérations une garantie morale et matériel [*sic*][32] *aussi* **plus** puissante. Prétendre que malgré une protection aussi efficace et aussi absolue les circonstances sont telles qu'elles réclament du Sacré Collège une déliberation précipitée, exceptionnelle et l'obligent à sacrifier les traditions séculaires de l'Église à l'imminence du péril, c'est méconnaître la valeur et le caractère de l'appui prêté depuis douze ans par la France au St. Siège Apostolique avec un désintéressement et une constance qui ne sont jamais démentis.

Le Gouvernement de l'Empereur ne saurait accepter une détermination *semblable* **de cette nature,** et, à plus forte raison, ne pourrait-il paraitre la sanctionner *en permettant à son armée d'être témoin de cette acte de défiance à son égard.* **en permettant à son armée d'être témoin de cette acte de défiance à son egard.**[33]

Le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté ne pourrait pas non plus *accepter* **assumer** par la continuation du séjour de ses troupes dans les Etats du St. Siège une solidarité quelconque dans les résolutions du Sacré Collège, si elles devaient s'appuyer sur le Bref susmentionné, et si l'élection du Successeur de Sa Sainteté Pie IX n'était pas accomplie par les Eminentissimes Cardinaux de l'Eglise, réunis en Conclave dans les formes et avec les délais canoniques, tels qu'ils ont été établis par la sage prévoyance du Pape Grégoire XV, afin de donner à la catholicité entière les guaranties légitimes qu'elle a le droit d'attendre.

En conséquence, le sous signé [*sic*][32] se fait un devoir d'informer Votre Éminence que du moment où il saura que les membres du Sacré Collège possesseurs du Bref Pontifical susmentionné se disposent à le faire valoir et à procéder à l'élection immédiate du Pape sans attendre les délais d'usage, il fera à l'instant même commencer l'évacuation de la ville de Rome et du territoire Pontifical, renvoyant à qui de droit la responsabilité des conséquences du départ de l'armée Française.

Le SS [soussigné] **a l'honneur d'appeler sur ces graves considérations l'attention la plus sérieuse de** Votre Éminence **lui laissant le soin** *pourra* **de** faire de cette communication tel usage qui lui paraitra convenable, *et lui donner toute la publicité qu'Elle jugera utile, le soussigné croyant devoir* l'informer**ant** qu'il en a adressé de semblables à d'autres membres du Sacré Collège.

Le Sous-signé [*sic*][32] prie Votre Éminence d'agréer les assurances de sa très haute considération.

À Son Éminence
Monsieur le Cardinal. . . .

---

[33] This passage was restored in the copy sent to Rome (cf. *ibid.*).

It will be seen that most of the above-indicated changes were obviously improvements in style and attempts to avoid certain repetitions of expressions. But there is also evidence in the deletions that the emperor was trying to minimize his future commitments to the Holy See by the deletion of the promise of future aid and by the omission of the words "security," "independence," "liberty," and "authority." Likewise the deletion of the threat of withdrawal in the middle of the document may have been not only to avoid repetition but also to put the threat at the end with greater emphasis.

After Viennot had made a copy of the note, it was either sent by the next courier or given to Gramont during his visit to Paris. At least it was sent to Rome and was deposited in the files, ready to be used as soon as Pius IX should die. Although these embassy files are not open to historians, we have confirmation that the document was received in the French embassy, since on December 30, 1862, Gramont's successor, La Tour d'Auvergne, sent a copy back to Thouvenel's successor, Drouyn de Lhuys.[34] Three and a half months after the note's composition Napoleon III revealed this tightly guarded secret to—of all people—Lord Cowley, the British ambassador. "In the case of the pope's death," he told Cowley, "and an attempt to hurry a new election in an unseemly manner, the French ambassador had orders to protest, and to *threaten* [Cowley's italics] the withdrawal of the troops should the election be proceeded with in the absence of the foreign Cardinals."[35]

This plan to threaten the surviving cardinals with the French evacuation of Rome obviously discouraged any negotiations with Italy on an earlier evacuation. After Cavour's death France, on June 15, 1861, had recognized Italy without combining that recognition with a treaty on the evacuation of Rome.[36] As a part of the formalities of recognition Ricasoli, Cavour's successor, had sent Count Arese as an official emissary to be received by Napoleon III. In addition

[34] Enclosure with dispatch, La Tour d'Auvergne to Drouyn de Lhuys, Rome, December 30, 1862, *ibid.*

[35] Cowley to Russell, private, Paris, October 16, 1861, PRO, FO, 519/229: 78-80; same to same, official dispatch, Paris, October 23, 1861, *ibid.*, 27/1398, no. 1255.

[36] For an account of France's recognition of the new Italian kingdom, cf. Lynn M. Case, *Franco-Italian Relations, 1860-1865. Thee Roman Question and the Convention of September* (Philadelphia, 1932), pp. 108-110.

to renewing relations with France, Arese was instructed to take up negotiations on the Roman Question. He was to ask the emperor to support renewed Italian-Vatican negotiations by threatening to evacuate Rome if the pope still refused to negotiate. The Italian offer would be Cavour's old formula of a free church in a free state or, if Napoleon III insisted, the Vatican City plan. If these negotiations did not succeed, Ricasoli would be glad to negotiate with France again on the terms approved by Cavour—Italian guaranties for the pope's present territory and French evacuation of Rome. In case of the pontiff's death France and Italy should bring pressure on the cardinals, through Cardinals Di Pietro and De Silvestri, to accept the previous Italian proposals. Also France and Portugal should work for the election of a liberal pope, either Santucci or Bofondi. At the same time, while the papal throne was vacant, the Roman people should be allowed to have a plebiscite to vote for annexation to Italy, and the presence of the French troops would guarantee the authenticity of the vote.[37]

Arese arrived in Paris probably late on June 29 and saw Thouvenel at 2:00 p.m. the following day. The French foreign minister rejected all of Ricasoli's proposals except Franco-Italian co-operation in case of the death of Pius IX. "We are ready to come to an agreement with you on a new pope. Santucci suits us: D'Andrea is another one, but he is not a likely candidate [*papable*]." But Arese, all discouraged, argued that, while the pope was sickly, he might live a long time, and the radical Mazzinians might take advantage of these delays. Then Thouvenel, without revealing that he had just approved the threat to the cardinals, replied:

> Don't you worry about a long time intervening before there is a vacancy in the Holy See. The pope's health is getting worse by the day, and a lot of things can happen before the month of November. The French garrison [in Rome] would be very useful to us during the conclave.[38]

On the next day (July 1) Arese went to see the emperor at Fontainebleau. After three days of conversations he reported the same unsuc-

---

[37] Ricasoli to Arese, Turin, June 27, 1861, *DDI*, ser. 1, I, 197-199, no. 171.

[38] For Arese's conversation with Thouvenel cf. Arese to Ricasoli, Paris, July 1, 1861, *DDI*, ser. 1, I, 206-208, no. 181; same to same, telegram, Paris, June 30, 1861, R. Bonfadini, *Vita di Francesco Arese* (Turin, 1894), p. 285.

cessful results with Napoleon III. He rejected all of Ricasoli's proposals except co-operation with Italy in case of the pope's death.

> The emperor added that he is ready to combine his efforts with ours to obtain in case of a conclave the election of a liberal pope. He approves the choice of Santucci, but doubts that, once he was elected, he would accept the Passaglia-Pantaleoni plan without modifications and renounce in fact the temporal power. If then the new pope was in fact reactionary [*retrivo*], the emperor not being bound by so many reasons for deference, would recall his troops. . . . In sum the emperor sees no easy way to solve the Roman Question *a priori;* he believes that the best decision would be to take advantage of changes which must occur not too long from now in existing circumstances.[39]

Both Thouvenel and Napoleon III now wanted to await the pope's death before they did anything about the Roman Question, and they both indicated that the presence of the troops in Rome would be helpful as a means of pressure on the conclave.

At first glance this whole affair might seem to be much ado about nothing, for Pius IX lived on for seventeen years more until 1878. Indeed, in spite of his chronic ailments and the trials and tribulations which had assailed him during his pontificate, the pope at the age of eighty-six had outlived most of those who had counted so much on his death. Cavour, Thouvenel, Napoleon III, and Victor Emmanuel II had all died in the intervening years. Thus in a sense we are dealing with a threat that was never made, to a conclave that never met.

Yet, this incident does have significance when set in the full-length history of the Roman Question. In its unfolding we see that in 1861 the Catholic great powers were still planning to exert their influence on the election of a pope. This attitude was not limited to France and Italy, because Rechberg, the Austrian chancellor, was making plans at this same time (June 27, 1861) to find a suitable conservative candidate and obtain his election.[40] Since suspicions of such activity were in all probability confirmed by accounts of Pantaleoni's mission to Paris, one can understand how Pius IX, in his state of

[39] Same to same, Paris, July 3, 1861, *DDI*, 1st ser., I, 216, no. 189.

[40] Bach to Rechberg, Rome, July 9, 1861, HHSA, PA, Rome Vatican, 1861, XI, 203, no. 19c.

mental anguish over the loss of his territories, the death of Cavour, the frequent recurrences of his illness, and these suspected efforts to choose his successor, might have written or rewritten such a brief either with or without the knowledge of Antonelli. This incident reveals also to what lengths Cardinal d'Andrea would go to prevent the scheme of a quick election, either because he conscientiously opposed such an irregularity or because he saw no chance of himself being elected without France's participation. Finally, and not least in importance, we are shown how far France was willing to go to counter such a reported move on the part of Pius IX. For a long time Napoleon III had wanted to withdraw his troops from Rome if he could do it without arousing opposition from his French Catholics. The holding of the election without the participation of the French cardinals would be a good pretext for the withdrawal without French clerical protests. On the other hand, such a threat could not be made without keeping his troops in Rome until the death of Pius IX. Since the pope's demise seemed imminent Napoleon III, therefore, gave up all immediate plans of evacuation in spite of urgings by Italy and England.[41] Indeed, there was a double threat in the draft note; the second one was that France would not recognize such an election ("le Gouvernement de l'Empereur ne saurait accepter une détermination de cette nature"). This is what Antonelli had predicted to Bach in his conversation on about July 8, that "this attempt . . . would very probably have as its only result the furnishing of a specious pretext to certain powers to challenge the validity of this election and reject the chosen candidates."[42]

Likewise this incident reveals that Gramont was not as pro-papal as his anti-clerical critics in France claimed. It was he, faithful to the interests of his country, who took the initiative in suggesting the threatening countermeasure, who, indeed, worked fast and intensely on composing a draft note. But the final version, deposited in the embassy for eventual use, was not the result of a rash decision; it was approved after considerable deliberation (six days) and after careful revision on the part of both Thouvenel and the emperor. Four months later in October, 1861, Napoleon III was still affirming to

[41] Cowley, in his mid-October conversation with Napoleon III, had urged an early withdrawal of French troops from Rome, at least simultaneously with the pope's death (cf. note 32 above).

[42] Cf. note 37 above.

Cowley that such a threat continued to be his policy. In the history of Franco-Vatican relations, therefore, this incident is not a might-have-been, but, more accurately, one of the many fits and starts and zigs and zags in the long history of the Roman Question.

University of Pennsylvania

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

A Popular History of the Reformation. By Philip Hughes. (Garden City: Hanover House. 1957. Pp. 343. $4.00.)

In announcing the publication of Monsignor Hughes' book, the *ALA Booklist* suggested that it be read in conjunction with Roland Bainton's *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century,* published as a Beacon paperback in 1956. Both books are offered as "popular" accounts, at least to the extent that they eschew the mechanics of scholarship. From the standpoint of book publishing the Bainton book is far more popular, with an attractive format, more legible type, and some twenty-six illustrations from Reformation sources. Furthermore Bainton's style is more readable. Monsignor Hughes tends to an involuted sentence structure which will at times prove confusing to the general reader. But what makes his book an eminently satisfying historical summary, not only for the educated layman but for the theological student or priest who thinks he knows his Reformation history, is the richness of concrete detail. Whereas Bainton inclines more to the generalizations of an historical essay, Hughes compiles popular statistics, describes geographical settings, and provides psychological insights into personalities.

Perhaps it is to be expected that this mastery of concreteness would appear most successfully in the chapters on the English Reformation. Even the style of these chapters is more genuinely popular. The least satisfactory part of the book is the introductory chapter on "The Traditional Christian Religion." Here the effort for compression may often be a source of confusion. Not only is there an apparent shift in point of view from what the Christian of the sixteenth century believed to a history of the Church's growth in Europe, but the development is often inadequate for real clarity. In view of what is to follow one would expect more specific attention to the belief in the Real Presence, more specific data on the growth of proprietary churches and their influence in the problem of lay investiture, more detailed description of such abuses as plurality of benefices and non-residence. The relationship of the latter to the staffing of the papal curia is well described in Volume III of Monsignor Hughes' *History of the Church.* One is disappointed at such indefinite references as, e.g., to "the thirty or forty universities of Italy, Spain, France, England, and Germany" (p. 14), and to the same universities, on page 25, "of these there were now, in 1517, thirty or more."

One hesitates to argue with any statement on the English Reformation by such a recognized authority as Monsignor Hughes. However, in his discussion of King Henry VIII's use of *praemunire* to engineer the arrest of Wolsey and the subsequent harassment of the English hierarchy, he writes: "The road which the king chose was one of the strictest legality" (p. 179). It is reminiscent of A. F. Pollard's statement in his *Henry VIII*: "His use of the statutes of praemunire was very characteristic. It was conservative, it was legal, it was unjust." W. T. Waugh, writing on "The Great Statute of Praemunire" in the *English Historical Review* (XXXVII, 174 ff.), makes clear that the bulls and instruments forbidden by the statute of 1393 were only those which concerned secular affairs "against the King, his crown, etc." It could be used as Henry used it only when the preamble and certain words of the enacting part were ignored. Even the words "against him," awkwardly inserted in the original text after the word "king," were left out, taking away all the restrictive force of the statute. In the light of the original text of *praemunire* one seems forced to conclude that Henry's use of the statute was not strictly legal.

This is, indeed, a minor point, and a debatable one, in a book that should remain for a long time as a standard popular treatment of the Reformation. Should further editions of the work be published it could be improved by the addition of a selected bibliography. One feels the need also for an additional chapter generalizing on the significance of the entire period. The book ends abruptly with the murder of Riccio in Scotland.

JOSEPH G. BAILEY

Wadhams Hall
Ogdensburg

Um die Reform und Einheit der Kirche: Zum Leben und Werk Georg Witzels. By Winfried Trusen. [Katholisches Leben und Kämpfen im Zeitalter der Glaubenspaltung, Heft 14.] (Münster: Aschendorff. 1956. Pp. 84. DM. 4.80.)

Ambrosius Catharinus Politus O. Pr.: Apologia pro veritate catholicae et apostolicae fidei ac doctrinae adversus impia ac valde pestifera Martini Lutheri dogmata (1520). [Corpus Catholicorum, Heft 27.] Edited by Josef Schweitzer. (Münster: Aschendorff, 1956. Pp. xxviii, 372. DM. 31.25.)

One reads with great pleasure Dr. Trusen's contribution to the study of the life and works of Georg Witzel (1501-1573). Trusen does not pretend in this study, which is an abridgment of his doctoral thesis,

either to write a complete biography of Witzel or fully to analyze his thought, but he has provided an invaluable guide to future studies in this important field. For if, as Trusen admits, Witzel was not one of the greatest personalities of his age, still his life and works present a fascinating picture of the aspirations, uncertainties, and disappointments of those who attempted to play a conciliatory role in this period of the Reformation. Having begun his ecclesiastical career as a priest, Witzel soon married and became a Lutheran pastor. Disagreement with Lutheran theology for what he considered to be the pastoral dangers of its doctrine of justification and a new ideal of reform which he had found by study of the Church Fathers and the liturgy brought Witzel back to Catholicism. He devoted the rest of his life to the defense, reform, and reunion of the Church. Trusen has divided his treatment of the work of Witzel under three subject headings: *antiquitas, reformatio,* and *concordia.* The last two were the aims of Witzel's life and the first, the return to the idealized early Church, was the way in his view to attain both. Following Erasmus enthusiastically, Witzel stopped short of his intellectualism and refused to reject the mediaeval heritage *en bloc.* What was good therein was to be retained and made pastorally effective. Witzel was destined, however, under the stress of the Counter Reformation and of its differently oriented spirituality to see fail his attempt to establish a more kerygmatic form of preaching and catechizing and to render the liturgy more meaningful, i.e., by the vernacular. This failure was paralleled by a like failure in his eirenical activities. One can regret only that this fine study has had to be cut, and especially that it was not possible to include the full bibliography.

One could scarcely find a greater contrast to the conciliatory personality of Witzel than the passionately polemical Dominican, Ambrosius Catharinus Politi. Some have seen in this self-taught theologian an ardent champion of the Catholic cause; others have stressed his hardheadedness and his quarrelsomeness. Not only Luther but also Cajetan and Erasmus, both of whom he believed had furthered heresy, were life-long targets of Politi, whose own occasionally singular theological opinions did not escape censure. The *Apologia* (1520) is a long, bitter, vituperative attempt to prove Luther a heretic. That it emanated from an Italian only increased the violence of Luther's reaction. This new edition, the first complete edition since 1521, was prepared by Josef Schweitzer. At the latter's death in 1952, August Franzen rewrote the biographical introduction, made minor corrections, and carried the work through to publication. It is a handsome success of editing and printing.

WILLIAM S. BARRON, JR.

The Catholic University of America

L'hypothèse libérale en Belgique. Documents inédits, 1839-1907. Edited by A. Simon. (Wetteren: Editions Scaldis, 1956. Pp. 381.)

With this volume the author continues his research in the field of Belgian Church-State relations which has occupied him for the past dozen years. Again, he uses the method that proved successful in *Catholicisme et politique,* published in 1955: building his text around documents which he has uncovered in private archives. The volume has an introductory essay of more than a hundred pages on various aspects of the confrontation of Catholic and liberal theory in nineteenth-century Belgium. This careful summary prepares the reader for the 260 pages of unpublished documents which illustrate the points in the introduction. Such a method demands access to source material that is relevant and important, and an editor with the competence to select the most significant of his finds. Professor Simon satisfies both conditions. His ten previous volumes in the field have signalized him as a man who combines painstaking research with acute analysis. For this work he has utilized the resources of five family archives and four of the major ecclesiastical archives. Out of the vast correspondence in these deposits, he has chosen samples that throw light on every aspect of his subject. His interest here is the conflict among Catholics over the issues raised by liberalism. As the period covered includes the Catholic congresses of Malines and the whole pontificate of Pius IX, no one need be reminded of the importance of the problems.

The division in Belgian Catholic opinion arose over the generous political and religious liberties granted in the national constitution of 1831. The majority of Belgian Catholics approved the liberal provisions of the constitution, either because they approved the principle or because they were impressed by the advantages that the constitution gave to the Church. Accordingly, they paid little attention to the encyclical *Mirari vos* (1832), and considered themselves justified because it made no specific mention of the constitution. A minority took the condemnations of the encyclical seriously and refused their approval to the theoretical basis of the constitution. It was from the ranks of the latter, known as the ultramontanists, that the distinction between the thesis and the hypothesis arose. The documents cited show that the distinction aimed to justify the arrangements of the past rather than to provide a guide for the future.

The use of the famous distinction did not dissolve all ambiguity. The liberal Catholics continued to question the absolute nature of the principles and to suggest that the very acceptance of the practice implied a measure of validity for the constitutional theory. The ultramontanists found support for their position in the tendency of the liberals to pass from benevolent neutrality toward religion to outright hostility. They could argue from evidence that the "modern liberties" led in practice to a form of

government which tended to divorce the Church from public life. The long range and indirect consequence of the liberal position seemed to be statism and laicism. When the liberals turned, in the second half of the century, to an all-out assault on Catholic education, the position of conservative Catholics hardened. Yet Cardinal Dechamps found a theological foundation for tolerance in Saint Thomas; the Catholic leader, Adolphe Dechamps, argued that civil and political rights granted to an individual citizen did not indicate any approval of religious error; the Belgian hierarchy remained steadfast supporters of the constitution; and the University of Louvain continued to be a bulwark of constitutionalism. Continued support for the Belgian constitution was rooted in the substantial advantages which the Church derived from it. Even though several of its provisions contravened the positions taken by the Holy See, there was little disposition either in Belgium or in Rome to attack it directly. These documents show how it was possible to take diverse attitudes toward it, but why it was difficult to condemn it explicitly.

JOSEPH N. MOODY

Ladycliff College

Kulturkampf. Staat und Katholische Kirche in Mitteleuropa von der Säkularisation bis zum Abschluss des Preussischen Kulturkampfes. By Georg Franz. (München: Verlag George D. W. Callwey. 1956. Pp. 355.)

This study merits attention because of its thorough treatment of the great Church-State conflict as a general central European experience, rather than as a purely Prussian affair and, too, by its wide reliance upon hitherto unused diplomatic sources. Unfortunately, the author's rigid views, to which he lends the authority and exactness of mathematical formulas, detract from the other real values of his work.

Franz's basic thesis is that monarchical governments and the Church, both indispensable in the social order, needlessly promoted the cause of revolution and socialism by their conflict. He implies, however, that churchmen and liberals were largely responsible because they were mutually intolerant and, except for an occasional statesman like Leo XIII, unable to think in larger terms than party or confession. In particular, the Vatican's insistence upon the declaration of papal infallibility, which Franz interprets as a revolutionary and political act devoid of any spiritual motivation, was a major factor in the general *Kulturkampf* even if governments overemphasized its meaning. The new Catholic press, popular associations, and parties, first made possible under the new constitutions

granted by monarchs after 1848, played significant roles, also, because they dealt with the most sensitive civic and religious issues from a purely confessional point of view.

The author is most reliable in his analysis of the conflict in Austria and Bavaria where it was mildest and in Switzerland where it ran a violent course. In the Hapsburg Empire the government, shaken by its defeats in Italy and Germany and under heavy pressure from national groups, wanted to win liberal support by regaining some of the extensive rights it had given to the Church under the concordat of 1855. Although the German Bishop von Ketteler had said that the concordat had gone too far, the Roman Curia refused to restore the State's rights in marriage, education, and certain inter-confessional affairs. The Austrian parliament, therefore, restored these powers by legislative action in 1867; the government's unilateral denunciation of the concordat only came in 1870 because it wanted to use liberalism as a basis for an anti-Prussian alliance with Italy and France and to end the bishops' use of it as a weapon against the new laws. But the piety of Francis Joseph and the monarchy's need of the Church kept the government from putting either the laws of 1867 or later regulatory legislation affecting the Church into full effect.

In the new German Reich it was Catholic Bavaria which took the initiative in trying to organize collective action on the part of European governments against the Vatican decrees and in proposing the Pulpit Law of 1871 in the German Federal Council. But these actions flowed from the government's desire to regain its former authority over the Church and not from any need or desire to propitiate liberals. The royal ministers were too conscious of the Catholic character of their state to satisfy repeated Prussian requests that they take further steps against hierarchy and priesthood. In Switzerland, where there was no monarchy to maintain order, strong radical and Calvinist groups had been taking offensive action against the Church in several cantons since the early 1840's; the Vatican vigorously responded, e.g., by putting the Jesuits in charge of the normal school in Luzerne in 1843 and by establishing a bishop in Calvin's city of Geneva in 1864. Since the liberals controlled both the central government and the stronger cantons, the Church's recovery of its freedom was slower than elsewhere.

Least palatable is Franz's treatment of the Prussian *Kulturkampf*. He rightly claims that the Church had more freedom in Prussia than in any Catholic state and that Bismarck strove to maintain good relations with the Holy See prior to 1871. The Prussian statesman's attitude only changed when he was faced with a strong Center Party which threatened German unity by stressing confessional issues, following particularistic leaders, and combining with the anti-German Alsacian and Polish parties.

He began the *Kulturkampf* as a political attack on the Center, did not foresee the extremes that it would entail, and early considered a settlement for political reasons. In contrast to Leo XIII who realized that Bismarck could not restore the *status quo* of 1871, Windthorst and the Center were major hindrances to peace because they wanted to score a party and confessional victory at the expense of the state.

However, even if Bismarck had a deep fear of the Center, one can hardly explain away his violent attack upon loyal Catholics on the above grounds since the party always stood well within the law. Nor does the author do much for Bismarck's reputation when he repeats the statesman's apology that Prussian bureaucrats went further than he wanted. Leo XIII may well have been right in trying to speed up reconciliation between Church and State, but Windthorst knew Bismarck better than anyone in the Roman Curia did and he realized that the chancellor wanted to destroy the Center Party as he did every party of independent mind. In the last analysis, the greatest contribution to the cause of revolution in Germany may have been made by Bismarck who denied all organized parties, whether Catholic, liberal, or socialist, the right to realize their aspirations and ideals even on a constitutional basis.

JOHN K. ZEENDER

University of Massachusetts

Destin du Catholicisme français, 1926-1956. By Adrien Dansette. (Paris: Ernest Flammarion. 1957. Pp. 493. 975 frs.)

Is the contemporary world being de-Christianized? If so, what counter measures are being taken? M. Dansette seeks answers for his own country. In the first chapter, a pessimistic one, he cites statistics showing that only a minority of Frenchmen are practicing Catholics and that in certain rural areas, and especially in congested urban districts, hardly any adults ever enter a church and fewer than twenty per cent of the children are baptized. For this sorry situation he blames the long absorption of clergy and leading laymen in the Church-State conflict emanating from the intellectual and political revolutions of the eighteenth century, an attendant espousal of the conservative "right" against the democratic "left," and, most significant, a blindness to the industrial revolution and to the proletariat it was creating. As a class, this has been not so much de-Christianized as born and brought up quite outside of Christianity. Left to itself, it has developed a peculiar *esprit de corps* and become atheist, Marxist, communist. In vain, in the 1890's, Leo XIII urged French Catholics to rally to the Republic; in vain, likewise, he called attention

to the social problem in his *Rerum novarum*. Only a minority of laymen gave heed, and such pioneering social Catholics of the time as Albert de Mun and La Tour du Pin were too much of the aristocracy to impress the working class.

A changed outlook M. Dansette traces from the morrow of World War I. The State-Church conflict is assuaged, and the rightist monarchical Action française is condemned and broken. New slants and impulses to French Catholic thought and action are supplied by Maritain's *Humanisme intégral* (1936) and Mounier's *Esprit* (1932-1950); by the work of the religious orders, most notably the Dominicans; by the frank and disillusioning book of the Abbés Godin and Daniel, *La France pays de mission* (1943), and the great pastoral of Cardinal Suhard, *Essor et déclin de l'Eglise* (1947). Moreover, during World War II, as part of the "Resistance" to both the Nazis and Vichy, a definitely democratic Catholic "left" emerged and became politically influential as the M.R.P. There appeared simultaneously the priest-workers.

To these M. Dansette devotes three whole chapters, which prove to be the meatiest and most interesting part of the volume. The movement began informally with priests in the French armed forces that were compelled to do war work in Germany. Then Cardinal Suhard became its chief sponsor and had it attached to the "Mission of France" and the "Mission of Paris" which were created respectively in 1942 and 1944 to evangelize the proletariat. A special seminary for it was established at Lisieux, and the number of priest-workers increased from six in 1946 to ninety in 1951, when Rome stepped in and stopped recruiting. The next year the seminary was transferred from Lisieux to Limoges, and in 1953 it was closed and solemn announcement was made by the papal nuncio of the end of the priest-worker movement. The author admits serious faults and difficulties in the movement: its novelty, the lack of needful background and proper training of its members, their internal conflict between vocation of priest and identification with fellow laborers, and, most serious, their tendency toward "Christian progressism," i.e., seeking to reconcile Christianity with Marxism. He clearly infers, however, that such faults might eventually have been overcome if more patience had been shown at Rome and less drastic repression exercised.

Unfortunately, he points out, there were religio-political differences between Italy and France about Communism, and the then Monsignor Ottaviani, who became Secretary of the Holy Office in 1951, was not given to compromise. As a result there were numerous defections of priest-workers to Communism, much deception and discouragement among militant Christians, and a re-enforcement of old working-class prejudices against the Church. On one hand, a romantic novel about the priest-

workers by Gilbert Cesbron, *Les saints vont en enfer* (1952), sold more than 200,000 copies, without counting serial publication. On the other hand, Cardinal Liénart of Lille publicly pronounced the suppression of the movement a "catastrophe," and in company with Cardinal Gerlier of Lyons and Cardinal Feltin, who had succeeded Suhard at Paris, set out in October, 1953, for Rome to protest direct to the pope. Pius XII received them amiably and agreed to a continuation of the "Mission of France," and of secular priest-workers on five conditions: (1) that they be chosen by their bishops; (2) that they receive a solid training; (3) that they limit manual labor to a maximum of three hours a day; (4) that they engage in no trade-union activities; (5) that they not live isolated but with a community of priests. Accordingly, in 1954, a constitution for them was promulgated at Rome and the seminary was re-opened at Limoges. The seminarians had numbered 200 in 1953, just before the closure; afterwards, in 1956, the number was 116.

So far, the fruitage of the priest-worker movement is admittedly disappointing. It has won as yet few converts to the Church, while it has lost a sizable number of its exponents to Marxism. The time, to be sure, has been brief.

Following the chapters on the priest-workers is a more encouraging one on the newer type of "community and missionary parish." This is more akin to the parish we know in the United States, though M. Dansette provocatively indicates the happy effects in France of doing away with fees and stipends for Masses, pews, baptisms, etc., of simplifying church construction and decoration, of emphasizing lay participation in the liturgy and having the priest face the congregation at the celebration of Mass. Further, he warmly approves of the recent reform of Holy Week observances and of the current pressure to replace Latin, at least in part, with the vernacular.

There is a factual chapter on latest developments of French Catholic Action, whose initialed proliferations (ACO, MFR, GDAC, FNAC, etc.) are as confusing to the American reader as our initialed government agencies must be to Frenchmen—and ourselves. In a concluding chapter the author offers some extremely interesting comments. The big problem facing the Church today, he maintains, is not the modernism of sixty years ago which Pius X condemned. It is rather the "demummification" of theology and its reinvigoration in terms comprehensible and applicable to life in the twentieth century. Only thereby, he thinks, will Catholic Christianity be enabled to vie successfully with Marxism or existentialism. For Catholics, both history and science must be stressed. While M. Dansette points to the social gospel as the crying need of the industrial age, he welcomes the contemporary trend toward the contemplative religious life.

He also perceives as hopeful signs of the time the inauguration in 1951 of triennial convocations of the entire French hierarchy and the expansion and betterment of catechetical instruction (2,700 lay catechists attended the meeting of 1955).

Is France re-Christianizing itself? The answer is not yet clear and unmistakable. With pardonable national pride, however, the author likens the French Church of today to ancient Israel passing out of Egyptian bondage, and reminds us that it is making more than its share of intellectual and devotional contributions to world Catholicism. (In an appendix, the question is briefly but pertinently raised whether Catholicism is not ceasing to be regarded as a world religion and becoming merely an appendage of the "West.")

Altogether, M. Dansette has given us an extraordinarily competent and illuminating book. It treats of current, crucial, and highly explosive happenings in the Catholic Church in France, and it does so with such candor, integrity, and painstaking care as befit the truly great historian. The author had already acquired an excellent scholarly reputation through his splendid two-volume religious history of France from 1789 to 1926. This reputation he fully upholds in the present specialized work, which, in addition to being important in itself, should expedite the production of the promised third volume of his general history. That volume I, for one, eagerly await, as I do an English translation of M. Dansette's other volumes, particularly the present one. Catholic Americans could only profit.

CARLTON J. H. HAYES

Jericho Farm
Afton, New York

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

Halycon Days: Story of St. Francis Seminary Milwaukee, 1856-1956. By Peter Leo Johnson. (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1956. Pp. xiv, 416. $5.00.)

Monsignor Johnson had been a professor in St. Francis Seminary for thirty-six years when he published its history. While he was engaged over the years in research for his books and articles, and in the direction of 240 candidates for the master's degree in church history, he became acquainted with the rich source material for St. Francis' first century. The great number of footnote references to articles in the *Salesianum*, a quarterly published by the alumni association of the seminary, and to "Studies in the History of St. Francis Seminary (1954)," produced under

his direction by students in their second year of philosophy (1953), clearly indicate his dependence upon and intelligent use of the research of others. By a more judicious use of that material, however, some of the repetition in the text would have been avoided.

The book tells the story of the seminary from its foundation to its centennial year. John Martin Henni, first Bishop of Milwaukee, established St. Francis' to solve the problem connected with the shortage of German-speaking priests which had caused him considerable anxiety from the day he arrived in his see in 1843. After the great German immigration from 1846 to 1854, of which Wisconsin received a larger number than any other state, the proportion of German priests to the German Catholic population was one to 2,000, and the people were scattered in rural areas. Owing to the scarcity of priests in Germany, and to the charges lodged by bigots and the intolerant that the ones who came from Europe were emissaries of a foreign power and dangerous to the government of the United States, Henni concluded that for the good of the Church and the souls under his care candidates for the priesthood must be sought and trained in his diocese. Michael Heiss and Joseph Salzmann, the two priests selected by him to superintend the construction of a seminary and to collect funds for it, had the courage and perseverance required for the task. To them, as well as to the brothers and sisters of St. Francis who cleared the land, made the bricks for the original buildings on the present campus, managed the farm and performed all kinds of menial tasks, Monsignor Johnson gives credit for enabling the institution to survive the difficult period of its infancy.

Until 1941, when the high school and the first two college years were moved to another campus, St. Francis Seminary accommodated students from the first year of high school through theology, the majority of whom during the first years were engaged in studying the classics and philosophy. Because so few of the young Germans in Wisconsin presented themselves as candidates for the priesthood, and because neighboring bishops sent students regardless of their nationality, the administrators of the institution had to modify the idea that the seminary was a special one for the training of German-speaking candidates for the altar. For many years, however, students of every nationality were encouraged and given an opportunity to learn the German language. It is to the credit of the faculty that so many students were prepared at the time of their ordination to minister to the needs of German Catholics in Wisconsin and in neighboring states.

Unlike many authors of the histories of educational institutions, Monsignor Johnson has performed the invaluable service of giving a thorough account of the course of studies in the seminary and noting the major

changes in it. The chapters entitled "Dawn of Drama," "The Stage," and "Music," however, are too detailed. They contain a considerable amount of trivia and repetition. Among the errors and peculiar readings in the volume the following should be noted: n. 11, p. 142, unusual use of *supra*; compare the form in n. 8, p. 224, with n. 13, p. 225, and n. 16, p. 226; compare n. 42, p. 236, with n. 1, p. 224; the initials in n. 2, p. 244, stand for H.[erman] J. H.[euser]; p. 189, line 10 from the end, and p. 245, beginning with line 9 from the end the meaning of the sentences; for "1893" read "1892" (p. 230) and for "1917" read "1918" (p. 382).

This volume will be welcomed by the students and alumni of St. Francis Seminary and by historians who are beginning to realize the value of institutional biographies.

PATRICK H. AHERN

The St. Paul Seminary

GENERAL HISTORY

Diccionario de historia de España desde sus orígines hasta el fin del reinado de Alfonso XIII. Two volumes. (Madrid: Revista de Occidente. 1952. Pp. xvi, 1386; 1566. 700 pesetas.)

Because of its importance it has been considered advisable to review this dictionary of Spanish history even five years after its publication. Anyone seriously interested in the history of Spain will need to know this work. It is a history of Spain in encyclopaedic form from prehistoric times to the end of the reign of Alfonso XIII. Its declared purpose is to aid readers when they find allusions to Spanish personages, historical events, political and social institutions, and economic phenomena. It includes much about the countries of Spanish colonization and records historical events affecting Spain which occurred elsewhere. The work is edited by Germán Bleiberg with the aid of nineteen directors of various sections. The articles are signed by more than sixty authors.

As one would expect, there are in alphabetical arrangement long lists of articles on royal personages that offer ready information on the many Alfonsos, Juans, Pedros, and Urracas. Sections of the country and cities are given only a short identification. The many different governmental institutions—officials, assemblies, courts, taxes—are given careful treatment. Forty columns are devoted to an analysis of various constitutions since 1808. The identification of the numerous chronicles of Spanish history will be helpful to scholars, as will also be the several articles on archives in Spain. Articles on the various auxiliary sciences will attract

the attention of historians. As for the one on palaeography, the later writings of Mallon on Roman writings were presumably not available to the author. He seems, however, to have incorporated some of Mallon's findings which have greatly changed the history of our handwriting. Rather needlessly the treatment of palaeography is broken up into several articles, e.g., "capital," "visigótica letra." The article on Spanish mediaeval diplomatics by the same author is much more valuable to historians because it brings together the research that has been done in Spanish documents.

Literary figures are left to the *Diccionario de literatura española*, but the present work offers articles of a general nature on language and literature, e.g., a sadly inadequate one on "Latin en la Peninsula," a better one on Iberian, a rather lengthy one, mostly names, on Spanish literature. Articles like "Arabismo en España" and "Historiadores de América" are practically without criticism and are mostly catalogues of authors. The treatment of "Judios" and "Sefardismo" are rather good, although the former has almost no indication of the large bibliography pertaining to the Jews in Spain. Ecclesiastical persons get small attention as compared with politicians. Thus St. Leander who received the Visigoths into the Catholic faith is skipped. St. Isidore of Seville is granted a mere half-column. St. Vincent Ferrer receives treatment, but not St. Teresa of Avila nor St. John of the Cross. The Franciscans, important as they were in Spanish history, are accorded a column and a half. The Dominicans and Jesuits fare somewhat better. The article on the Augustinians is not abreast of recent scholarship on the *Rule* of St. Augustine. The Jerónimos deserve more space than they receive.

For the most part factual, the articles are written with great calmness and restraint. The authors almost never take a position. The article on the Spanish-American War affords a mild and understandable exception. It is particularly unfortunate that so little or no bibliography appears in most of the articles. This is compensated for only in part by a bibliographical list on Spanish history in an appendix. It is interesting to find the authors using bibliography emanating from the United States, although not all of it and not always the best. The two pudgy octavo volumes, about four inches thick, are not very attractive in format, but they cost less than would a set of several volumes. The print is sharp and clear. A useful chronological index of sixty columns, sixteen maps, and two pages of *addenda* and *corrigenda* bring the work to an end. The editors are presumably right in their boast that this is the first dictionary of its kind. The little dictionaries of American history do not compare with this big work except in name.

ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER

The Catholic University of America

Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education. By Donald Lemon Clark. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1957. Pp. xii, 285. $4.50.)

Donald Lemon Clark, professor emeritus of rhetoric at Columbia and author of *John Milton at St. Paul's School,* describes his latest work as a book "about teaching." "Can," he asks, "the art of speaking well be taught?" In studying the answers which the classical world gave to this question, Clark uncovers a curious parallel to the modern debate which pits the teacher's college and liberal arts school against one another. Plato is cited as denouncing the Sophists, the professional educationists of his day, for "they were devoted to the practical arts of getting on in the world instead of to the disinterested search for abstract and theoretical truth" (p. 6). Thus the work has a broader scope than someone unfamiliar with classical rhetoric might suspect. Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian—to name only three of the better known authors—treated many problems of teaching *ex professo.* By analyzing the wealth of material which survives, Clark has provided an epitome of the educational philosophy which dominated the schools of antiquity and a descriptive sketch of the teaching techniques they used.

Happily Mr. Clark has not revivified the canard which insists that the Christians deserted the centers of non-Christian learning *en masse.* Hilary of Poitier, Augustine, Jerome, and Sidonius Apollinaris were, as Clark states, in the classical tradition; and he could have strengthened his statements with examples from the three Cappadocians and St. Ambrose whose works, on every page, betray rhetorical training. Granted, moreover, Clark's willingness to quote entire paragraphs—sometimes lengthy ones—his work would have benefited from more frequent reference to Augustine's *De doctrina christiana.* Augustine, e.g., has better and more pertinent remarks to make about the three types of style than does Milton whom Clark prefers to quote (pp. 104-107). The historian may be disturbed at Clark's admitted disregard (p. 66) for historical developments in the eight centuries—Socrates to Ausonius—which he treats. Yet there is much here to interest the student of ancient history. Clark's exposition of the *declamatio* (pp. 222-223), an academic exercise in speech composition, helps to explain a favorite device of Thucydides, Tacitus, and all the major historians in ancient times who composed fictitious orations to delineate character and to recreate a moment of history. Prolonged speeches often camouflage a dearth of factual information and, like so many of the devices used by classical historians, have their prototypes in the rhetorical exercises of Greco-Roman education.

BERARD MARTHALER

Assumption Seminary
Chaska, Minnesota

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

The Gothic Cathedral. Origins of Gothic Architecture and the Medieval Concept of Order. By Otto von Simson. (New York: Pantheon Books. 1956. Pp. xxiii, 307. 44 plates, 10 figures. $6.50.)

The greatness of so splendid a style as that of early Gothic architecture is well measured by its mystery. This Gothic never yields its ultimate secret. It remains an inexhaustible source whence successive interpreters may continue to draw at will, and without apparent prejudice to new opportunities for interpretation left for their followers. All that these various efforts can make Gothic say to us seems fragmentary, and indicative of a greater silence. Yet what the recent interpreters of Gothic have had to offer is precious, even if incomplete; and the world must be grateful to Lefèvre-Pontalis, Aubert, Gall, Sedlmayr, and to the many others who, like them, have made the Gothic speak to us. Into this meritorious fraternity now enters Otto von Simson with a book which not only offers something new but also makes an excellent guide to the contributions of those who have gone before him.

For Simson theology is a better key to the Gothic than technics. His books deals with the reflection in early Gothic architecture of contemporary (and antecedent) ecclesiastical life and thought—and politics. He stresses the importance which the Christian Platonism of the famous School of Chartres and the critical asceticism of St. Bernard had at the birthtime of Gothic, and which the pseudo-Dionysian mysticism of light had at its accepted birthplace, St. Denis. To these conditioning factors Simson attributes what he considers the two major aspects of Gothic, viz., its mathematical proportioning and its luminosity, or measure and light. Gothic measure is traced to the ancient and mediaeval concepts of the metaphysical and transcendental validity of mathematics—universal, but made specific and sensible to man in music and architecture, which are, therefore, both of anagogical utility, elevating man to God. Gothic luminosity is derived mainly, in Simson's presentation, from the pseudo-Dionysian writings, although there are older sources; and it is similarly anagogical, perhaps even more effectively so, because of the diaphonous walls suggestive of the limitless. Simson gives considerable attention to ecclesiastical politics, notably to Suger, who is treated sympathetically. With Suger, and with other churchmen, the author is inclined to emphasize the potentially significant role they may have played personally in the development of Gothic architecture. There may be a mild element of hero-worshiping here: we are impelled to laud Gothic, and we know practically nothing about its early architects; only the commissioning churchmen are historically tangible enough for us to fall back upon for our heroes.

A thirty-page appendix to the book consists of a report "on the proportions of the south tower of Chartres Cathedral" by Ernst Levy (who incidentally deals with the proportions of the west front *in toto*). Levy fits the proportions of the famous *vieux clocher* into a set derived from an octagon whorl. He finds the basic octagon (from which the others that give proportions are derived by the standard practice of "whirling" expansion or contraction) to have a side of 16.44 m., which is the width of the tower (from buttress to buttress above plinth) and at the same time the width of the cathedral nave (taken between centers of piers). A large chart pocketed inside the back cover of the book graphically presents Levy's findings, which are included to fortify the thesis of the book that Gothic design is mathematical. While Simson's book only undertakes to deal with St. Denis as the beginning, and Chartres as the fruition, of early Gothic architecture, it actually throws many sidelights on other great buildings of the time—particularly on Sens as the first Gothic cathedral. It is, in general, a good book for the beginner in mediaeval studies to read because it will serve to introduce him to many aspects of the period—economic, literary, administrative—beyond those usually associated with church architecture.

On the bibliographical side the work is very strong. The footnotes are copious and lead the reader out in all directions with temptation to further reading. They are supplemented by an appended "List of Works Cited," which gives requisite bibliographical data for the publications cited briefly in the footnotes. This list can be recommended to librarians desirous of filling gaps on their shelves, as can be, of course, the book itself, which a Bollingen subsidy has put within the price range of all.

JOHN SHAPLEY

The Catholic University of America

A Royal Impostor. King Sverre of Norway. By G. M. Gathorne-Hardy. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1957. Pp. ii, 305. $6.75.)

This book is the result of more than thirty years preoccupation with one of the most interesting characters of twelfth-century Norway, Sverre the Impostor. Born of humble parents before 1149, reared in the far off Faroes, educated for and ordained to the priesthood, Sverre appeared in Norway in 1174. By 1177 he had forsaken his sacerdotal calling, assumed the leadership of a band of malcontents and adventurers and laid claim to the throne of Norway as the bastard son of Sigurd Munn (1136-1155). By a series of brilliant land and sea campaigns he achieved his goal only to find that, apart from his own army, no one wanted him as

king. As a result, throughout his reign (1184-1202) and for a further thirty-eight years, Norway was torn asunder by civil strife. Such are the main facts of Sverre's career. Norwegian nationalist historians, uncritically accepting the Sverre Saga, have depicted him as a national hero. Contemporary accounts not controlled by Sverre, those of Edward of Newburgh, Saxo Grammaticus, and Pope Innocent III, portray him as a notorious son of perdition who usurped the throne and brought bloody slaughter and extreme damage to the whole of Norway. Mr. Gathorne-Hardy, long a student of Norwegian history, shows Sverre to be neither complete hero nor scoundrel, but most certainly a disruptive force in the social, economic, and political development of the country.

The author divides his work into two parts the first of which sets the historical stage for the appearance of the central figure and enables readers, unfamiliar with Norwegian history, to appreciate the story of this man and his times. The second part contains the biography of Sverre with an estimate of his character and influence. To obtain a full picture of the man the author supplements the sources by "a reasoned use of the reconstructive imagination." Not all will agree with his conjectures, e.g., this reviewer found his explanation of how and why Sverre became an impostor especially weak and unsatisfying. Racial prejudice rears its ugly head in the author's characterization of Harald Gille: "He had the well known Irish trait of combining outward charm and a genuine desire to please with inhuman cruelty and ferocity, and a superstitious piety with complete untrustworthiness." On the whole the story of Sverre is entertainingly told in precise and scholarly fashion. Mr. Gathorne-Hardy has made a notable contribution to the list of books in English on Scandinavian history.

GERALD A. KINSELLA

College of the Holy Cross

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation. By E. Harris Harbison. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1956. Pp. ix, 177. $3.00.)

Looking at the work of the scholars of the Reformation period and some of their influential predecessors, the author has attempted to investigate the relationship between Christianity and scholarship. Can a Christian be a scholar? Obviously, as he answers, many a great Christian has felt himself called to be a scholar, and such scholarship has played a significant role in the development of Christianity. The author deplores the fact that

in the secular universities today the aims of scholarship and teaching are no longer bound together "within the context of Christianity," with the result that research is motivated by nothing much higher than the desire for academic kudos, and teaching is mere training for various specialized vocations. The remedy he proposes is the "development of more fruitful contact" between the members of the seminaries and the universities—which strikes this reviewer as being not very likely to disturb the secularity of present-day secular universities.

After saying a few words about Christian scholarship of the mediaeval period, Mr. Harbison turns to that of the Renaissance period saying that "the particular kind of reconciliation between classicism and Christianity which was represented by Aquinas . . . Dante . . . and the Gothic Cathedral could not last forever because it was based on hazy and inaccurate notions of the past, both classical and Christian" (p. 42). He does not feel, however, that the Renaissance scholars, Petrarch, Pico della Mirandola, and Valla were able to attain a "clear sense of the calling" as Christian scholars (p. 55). He believes, rather, that John Colet was the first to absorb Renaissance scholarship and to direct it to a purpose fully Christian, and he notes the influence of Colet upon Erasmus in this regard. The author states that Erasmus' friend, St. Thomas More, died for the cause of Christian unity, "though he knew as a scholar that the papal claims were a historical growth" (p. 97). This may be true for More's earlier period; but he came, as a scholar, to a far different understanding before his death. More himself tells us in a letter to Thomas Cromwell of March 5, 1534, that through the reading the King's *Assertio septem sacramentorum*, and the scholarly study of the Greek and Latin fathers, as well as decisions of the councils, he had come to understand that his conscience would be "in right great perell" if he should "deny the primatie to be provided by God" [*The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More* edited by E. F. Rogers (Princeton, 1947), p. 498]. Thus, what More had come to see through scholarship—Christian scholarship—was quite different from that which is indicated by the author of this book.

Professor Harbison considers that the "Protestant Reformation began in a scholar's insight into the meaning of scripture" (p. vi), but after reading his treatment of Luther we begin to wonder. After noting that Luther in translating Romans 3:28 added the word *allein*, the author gives Luther's explanation of the addition from the standpoint of the requirements of German usage; yet, the author admits that it was "not entirely coincidence" that the translation helped make the case for justification by faith alone still clearer and stronger (p. 130). In regard to the exclusion of the Epistle of St. James by Luther, the author admits that "the ultimate test of genuineness was Luther's spiritual experience, not historical evidence." The reader will be somewhat puzzled, then, when he finds Professor

Harbison saying three pages further on that Luther "never imposed personal experience or official dogmatic teaching upon the text of Scripture in the way some late medieval mystics and Schoolmen did. . . ." The chapter on Calvin is interesting, and the author is undoubtedly correct in saying that Calvin was more influenced by humanism than was Luther.

WALTER W. J. WILKINSON

Georgetown University

The Emperor Charles the Fifth. By Royall Tyler. (Fair Lawn, New Jersey: Essential Books, Inc. 1956. Pp. 375. $7.50.)

In this posthumous book Mr. Royall Tyler produced the most comprehensive biography of Charles V yet to appear in English even including the translation of Karl Brandi's work. The author, an American educated in England who spent most of his life abroad, was eminently qualified to undertake the biography. His knowledge of the sources, both archival and monographic, was thorough. His evident sympathy for his subject was complete. His closing remarks are quoted from Quijada's estimate: "Thus ended the greatest gentleman there ever was, or ever will be" (p. 285).

Yet despite the sympathy, the comprehensive grasp of the first half of the sixteenth century, the tremendous depth of detailed knowledge, the book is not wholly satisfactory. Charles never emerges as a person; he moves through the pages woodenly, too often heightened by the downgrading of his associates. Mr. Tyler's great admiration for his hero frequently caused him to lose contact with Charles' opponents whom he failed to understand. Frequently Charles' motivations and those of his opponents and associates are conjectured, perhaps on the basis of fact, but never with the needed clarity or assurance. Indeed, conjecture is over-used throughout the volume. Further difficulties stem from the fact that as comprehensive as this work is, at times too much is attempted in too few pages. Frequently the reader reels from page to page inundated by detail, regretting that this was not a two-volume work. But elsewhere there are repetitions, sometimes contradictory (e.g., pp. 85, 119) arising from the division of the book which is generally topical. Another element which takes up otherwise much needed space is the author's frequent tendency to editorialize.

Despite the fact that Spain does not receive as much attention as she deserves, the work is otherwise well balanced. Too often Charles' biographers have seen him only as a German emperor or as a Spanish king. However, England does receive space which is out of proportion to her role in Charles' life and in the Europe of the time. This is not surprising,

for Mr. Tyler was editor of the calendar of Spanish state papers for the reigns of Edward VI and Mary I. The emphasis on England is not unwelcome, for the author wrote those sections with much more assurance and his treatment of the break with Rome is most dispassionate. Also welcome is the chapter on Spain's economic plight during Charles' reign. The bibliographical essays are very well done. The bibliography itself is extensive even though the documentation throughout the book is spotty. There are also three genealogical tables and thirty-eight plates chosen by the author.

GEORGE C. A. BOEHRER

Georgetown University

Studies in Social History. (A Tribute to G. M. Trevelyan). Edited by J. H. Plumb. (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1955. Pp. xv, 287. 21/s).

This volume of essays on various facets of English social history was brought together to honor the dean of English social historians, and it constitutes an important tribute to Professor Trevelyan both because of the high quality of the contributions and the number of esteemed contributors. Who could quarrel with such distinguished authors as: A. L. Rowse, W. G. Hoskins, Wallace Notestein, C. V. Wedgewood, H. J. Habakkuk, J. H. Plumb, G. S. R. Kitson Clark, and N. G. Annan. Mr. Plumb has, indeed, assembled a corps of the most honored historians in England.

However, as the editor states in his introduction a tribute to one of England's most readable historians can only be a true tribute if it is readable. Social history by its close attention to detail frequently becomes unwieldy, for an overabundance of facts may arise to obscure the broad landscape of the past that social history at its best can so ably portray. An example of this danger might be cited, perhaps a bit unfairly, by this quotation from N. G. Annan's essay "The Intellectual Aristocracy": "One of Thomas Babington's sons had a daughter Rose Mary who married the Rev. Charles John Elliott. His mother was a great-great granddaughter of Isaac Newton's mother, and his father was an adherent of the Chapham Sect who married the Rector of Chapham's sister." Such an item of genealogical ephemera might be welcomed in an historical monograph, or be honored among the gray-beards gathered around the stove in a village store, but to the average reader it seems both baffling and dull.

There are two essays that stand out because they follow in the true Trevelyan line. One of these is Mr. Plumb's "The Walpoles: Father and Son," a detailed yet delightful account of the austere home life of Colonel Robert Walpole of Houghton, compared to the more ostentatious life of his

son, particularly during the latter's long and extravagant career as England's first minister and the eighteenth century's most successful peculator. The other outstanding essay in readability is Kitson Clark's "The Romantic Element 1830 to 1850." His efforts fulfill Mr. Clark's promise ". . . to recover something of the atmosphere in which men lived" by examining what they read, what pictures they admired, what speeches they applauded, and in general the skeleton of the past upon which the fabric of social history is created. Also of interest to the general reader is the contribution of A. L. Rowse on Nicholas Roscarrock and his unfinished and unpublished "Lives of the Saints." The essay is an excellent exposition of the religious views of a persecuted Catholic who remained in England during and after the reign of Elizabeth.

Although some of the contributions to this volume may be criticized for neglecting general interest and readability, all are of interest. Mr. Plumb is to be congratulated for a selection that ranges over English social history from the sixteenth to the seventeenth century.

JOHN M. LAMB

Lewis College

Bismarck, Gladstone, and the Concert of Europe. By W. N. Medlicott. (New York: John de Graff, Inc. Pp. xiv, 353. $7.00.)

To an imaginative historian the political antithesis, Bismarck-Gladstone, offers irresistible opportunities to contrast power and persuasion, realism and cynicism and optimism. Professor Medlicott, a distinguished English historian of liberal temperament, has made the most of the opportunity. His monograph, rich in detail from new archival sources, takes up the crucial question posed by Bismarck's German settlement: what diplomatic principle could assure an international equilibrium?

Bismarck and Gladstone offered rival principles, each reflecting its author's political morality. Gladstone's Midlothian speeches during the electoral campaign of 1878-1880 proposed to revive the Concert of Europe, an informal but serious colloquium of great powers to guarantee public law as their common interests. Bismarck's diplomacy, built on the post-Crimean wreckage of the concert, tacitly assumed that great powers could no longer reach diplomatic compromise about their vital interests. Between 1879-1881 each protagonist's diplomacy sought its ideal end in attempting to settle problems left over from the Congress of Berlin. Hence the narrative concentrates on great power diplomacy attending the frontier disputes between Turkey, Greece, and Montenegro; and on negotiations for the Three Emperors' Alliance. Bismarck's success in organizing the

latter on June 18, 1881, doomed Gladstone's ill-starred effort to settle the Greek question through the concert. Or, as Professor Medlicott sees it, Bismarck threw back Gladstone's challenge to his European system. Europe had to accept the fateful Bismarckian alliance that helped to bring on war in 1914. Though it is not alliances *per se* that the author blames, so much as the atmosphere of uncertainty and suspicion that they inspired.

Diplomatic history took a decisive turn in 1879-1881, according to Professor Medlicott, who also dates serious Anglo-German rivalry from those years. It originated in the titanic clash between diplomatic system-builders: the one cosmopolitan, humane, and liberal; the other national, military, and authoritarian. Evidence for this personal clash does not lie in the documents themselves, despite Bismarck's unrelenting personal antipathy for Gladstone, and the latter's outspoken impatience with continental political mores. It is Professor Medlicott's bold reconstruction, made possible by the lengthening historical perspective. Even though his design is too highly drawn—and colored only in black and white—it deserves attention because history stands in need of organizing principles. All too many diplomatic historians have been content to let the sequence of events serve as their own explanation. The author's moral judgments and his thesis appear consistent with the latest trend of Bismarck scholarship, at least in the English-speaking world. Bismarck no longer appears to be the molder of the "long peace" after 1871, the master diplomat whose maladroit successors "ruined" his handiwork. His revolutionary diplomacy, so disdainful of public law and the rights of the historic nations, exploited the European concert's weakness. How much more praiseworthy was Gladstone's attempt to revive the concert, not as an instrument of reaction—as Metternich had envisaged it—but to insure the common European interest in progress and liberty!

WILLIAM O. SHANAHAN

University of Oregon

Coventry Patmore. By E. J. Oliver. (New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc. 1956. Pp. 211. $4.00.)

In his *Poets and Mystics* E. J. Watkin has a chapter, "In Defense of Margery Kempe," England's fifteenth-century peregrinating mystic, whose story is the first autobiography in our language. To some extent, Mr. Oliver's study of Coventry Patmore may be considered a defense. The Victorian convert poet of marriage was, like Margery, preoccupied with the love of God for the human soul, though in a more sophisticated fashion. His life, like hers, became "a sign that shall be spoken against";

in his case, because of the three wives, the contradictions of his temperament, and the incongruities in his ideas. Living fully and articulately, neither could escape the charge of inconsistency. And logic is more difficult to exemplify if one professes high religious ideals: "Once a man living in this world tries also to live in the other, he has to some extent to make a fool of himself. . . . Patmore was no exception."

By a blend of admiration and criticism Mr. Oliver evokes a vital Victorian figure; truly of his age when, in the spirit of the romantic movement, he celebrated the love of man and woman—then was careful to place his *Angel in the House* in a typical bourgeois setting. But "essentially a nonconformist" he reacted against some current trends, as when, disliking emotionalism in art, he decided to build "the only Catholic church in England which had no trace of bad taste." Characteristic, too, was what Mr. Oliver calls his "constitutional antipathy toward the clergy," and for which he gives many explanations. Commenting on a statement of Patmore's that "all Poets and Prophets have hated Priests—as a class—and it has been their vocation from the beginning to expose, 'Ecclesiasticism,'" Mr. Oliver regards this last word as the clue to Patmore's prejudice. Enamored of the mystical way, he distrusted organization and institutionalism in religion, and those who were concerned with the administration of these things. Another idiosyncracy was his aversion to the ideal of virginity. In Mr. Oliver's opinion this basic philosophic weakness was attributable to his obsession with marriage and the analogy between divine and human love. Pointing out the absurdity of such over-emphasis, the author notes that a woman victimized by a bad husband "is unlikely to be moved by the consideration that her marriage is a symbol of the relationship between God and the soul." Yet the child who was closest to Patmore, his favorite daughter, Emily, entered the convent of the Holy Child.

The author subjects the social views of Coventry Patmore to similar scrutiny and intelligent analysis, regretting that "he, who laid such emphasis on the body and its necessary share in the spiritual life, should have refused to admit that society, which is only the body of mankind, could also receive the spirit. His God had come down into the human body, but not into the body politic." In his economic individualism and his political conservatism, Patmore was surely the child of his century; but in his courteous attitude toward men and women who sincerely held religious viewpoints differing from his own he foreshadowed one of the better features of our day. We should be grateful to Mr. Oliver for bringing out such varied aspects of this many-sided man.

GEORGIANA P. MCENTEE

Hunter College

AMERICAN HISTORY

The Cultural Life of the American Colonies, 1607-1763. By Louis B. Wright. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1957. Pp. xiv, 292. $3.75.)

In the book under review Dr. Wright has provided a useful single-volume study of a complex, paradoxical, and not always understood era of the American past. For the serious student its outstanding quality is the author's willingness not only to write of the everyday life and the high aspirations of the early Americans, but as well to present for consideration many of the reasons for this feature or that, for this or that trend in the thinking and the cultural accomplishments of the colonials. To be sure, this study does not pretend to know all the answers and, indeed, such reasons as are advanced to account for a particular judgment, e.g., the place of the Protestant ethic in the colonial American success story, are offered in a spirit of earnest inquiry. Such an analysis of colonial culture has no counterpart in the original American Nation Series. Written from a wide examination of recent scholarship, it is suggestive of the greater importance which historians attach to the total experience of a people.

The volume covers the years from 1607 to 1763 and is organized topically. It begins with an over-all discussion of society in the South and in the North with attention given to the various non-English peoples helping to make up the population and likewise to the influential economic conditions. Once this ground work is laid in the opening chapters there follow discussions of colonial culture in its various aspects: learning and education, religion, the fine arts, science, and the means of communication. Each of these topics is analyzed in detail by referring to the contributions of numerous individuals. Dr. Wright has avoided one of the pitfalls of such a presentation, viz., an encyclopedic effect, by a wise selection of illustrations which are treated with sufficient depth to make the personalities and their contributions intelligible. Rightly, this cultural history is told in terms of the men—and occasionally of the women—who made it.

One impression left with this reviewer is the considerable care exercised by the author to achieve an evenness of emphasis. An excellent bibliography has been provided that is a fair reflection of the organization of the text itself. Yet this insistence upon an even emphasis may be looked upon as a weakness as well as a strength in the book. We are tempted to ask ourselves if this does not tend to distort one's perspective of colonial American culture. Such distortions are, perhaps, most noticeable in the author's examination of the culture of New England. Here it would seem there is an unwarranted de-emphasis of the New England mind and will, highly persuasive factors for New England ways when the Puritan religion loomed large. The reason for this particular defect may also lie in the

remarkable transformation experienced by the New England mind in the course of 150 years and thus the difficulty of precise portrayal in a work of limited scope. Or it may be due to Dr. Wright's greater interest in the southern and middle colonies where his sympathies are more marked. In any case, the passages dealing with the New England mind are not as rewarding as those treating other aspects of the story. Whatever additional defects the reader may find are minor ones and will not seriously detract from the value of this survey of colonial American culture.

DAVID H. BURTON

Saint Joseph's College
Philadelphia

Errand into the Wilderness. By Perry Miller. (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 1956. Pp. x, 244. $4.75.)

In the present juncture of world affairs with the ever-enlarging burden of American global responsibilities it is natural that thinking people should ask: what is the meaning of the American experience; what relevance, if any, has it for the contemporary scene? For the past twenty-five years Perry Miller has been devoting himself to the task of finding an answer to the first question. He started his quest, as he says, at the beginning—with the settling of New England. Most of the ten essays in this volume (a number of which have been previously published) are concerned with the New England heritage, but it is clear that the author is not so much concerned with giving a systematic analysis of this heritage as he is anxious to sift it for the fundamental themes, or theme, of the American historic experience. These essays are not light reading, and it would be easy to misunderstand the author's conclusions if one were to read just isolated essays.

An election sermon preached in 1670 by Samuel Danforth gives Mr. Miller his title and provides him with his theme. Discussing the Puritan conception of their errand, or purpose of settling the wilderness, he shows that the really energizing motive behind the great migration to the new world was religious conviction. This was as true of Virginia, he argues, as of New England. Throughout the volume he insists that the errand was of far greater importance than the wilderness which was settled. "The mind of man," he says, "is the basic factor in human history." Consequently, the reader rightly expects that the author will show the changing interpretation of purpose as Americans are influenced by rationalism, naturalism, and industrialism. On the basis of his thorough reading of the sources Mr. Miller comes to the conclusion that having been disappointed in the first purpose of their settling, viz., to set up a model theological

community which would be copied in Europe and which would train leaders for that day, the second and third generation Puritans faced the necessity of giving their own meaning to the errand that had been run by their fathers. From this point on, he says, *the* theme of the American experience, "Nature versus civilization," has been expressed in increasingly non-theological terms, although it is still fundamentally the same struggle to harmonize ideas with environment, spirituality with enterprising activity, individualism with communal order. Conventionalized Protestantism, rejecting Jonathan Edwards' effort in the face of encroaching rationalism to satisfy the soul thirsting for God, settled for a moral code of social welfare. This has not satisfied the God-hunger of the sensitive American who, in the author's words, feels within himself "the impulse to reject completely the gospel of civilization, in order to guard with resolution the savagery of his heart."

As has already been said, this is not an easy book to read. The chapter entitled "The Marrow of Puritan Divinity" is not only long; it is also filled with highly technical theological concepts and terms. Another chapter on "The Rhetoric of Sensation" is, in essence, an epistemological comparison of Locke, Berkeley, and Edwards. Other chapters are replete with cosmology. Frequently deep and penetrating, the book is never dull. With a number of his insights and judgments many readers will surely quarrel, but all will have to agree that Mr. Miller has thoroughly culled his sources, provocatively interpreted them in the light of contemporary thought, and presented them to modern readers with understanding and clarity of expression.

SISTER JOAN DE LOURDES LEONARD
Saint Joseph's College for Women
Brooklyn

Background to Glory: the Life of George Rogers Clark. By John Bakeless. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1957. Pp. 386. $6.00.)

Mr. Bakeless has presented an interesting blend of facts from many sources mingled with—if not fiction—at least his suppositions of what occurred. George Rogers Clark emerges as an arresting figure, human in his weaknesses, and all too life-like in his sad ending. The author has sieved the voluminous papers of Clark and much other pertinent primary material, and his familiarity with the writings of the colonel led him to use exact transcriptions, often in supposed conversations. As the Virginian frequently employed phonetics and abbreviations, reading would have been facilitated by using modernized English. For the public notices, or "placarts," as they were called, the idiom of the commander would then have been refreshingly interesting.

For the reader familiar with American Catholic history the treatment of "the Patriot Priest of the West," Father Pierre Gibault, is not entirely satsifying. In respect to facts, the missionary was not "of Sardinian birth," for he had been born in or near Montreal on April 7, 1737. And there is no doubt that Gibault was in charge of the parish of the Immaculate Conception at Kaskaskia from the time of his arrival, and not "since 1770," as Bakeless asserts. In the first baptism performed on October 1, 1768, he signed in a bold hand "prêtre curé," a title never relinquished during his tenure, thouhg sometimes varied with "vicaire général." In interpreting Gibault's contribution to the Revolutionary successes of Clark the author is less benign than Catholic writers have been. The priest appears virtually groveling during his initial visit to the American commander; later his paddling official papers across the ice-dotted Mississippi was somewhat a flight from the scene of battle. This characterization was not in keeping with a priest who wrote his bishop in 1770: ". . . when I go on a journey I am always armed with my gun and two pistols, with the intention of preventing my being attacked. . . ." With the Virginian, Gibault suffered a proportionate financial loss in the supplies he furnished to the Americans for which reimbursement never was forthcoming. And Clark probably never was recompensed for the sixty dollars paid for the horse on which the priest rode to Vincennes to induce his parishioners to join the revolting colonists. Even so, it was one of the colonel's most remunerative investments.

Quite matter-of-factly a love story was introduced in the meeting of George Rogers Clark and Teresa de Leyba, sister of the Spanish lieutenant governor of the infant St. Louis. Without very convincing documentation, the señorita reappeared briefly throughout the account for forty long years. The final page was poignant with the requited but unfulfilled love of the pair, separated by every possible factor save their mutual attraction. The method of indicating sources in citations given in the back, incidentally, seemed a happy solution for satisfying those who dislike even an indication of documentation in the text, and those who are anxious to know the sources. While some omissions were noticed, the index entries were accurate. A map inside the cover was a helpful visual guide.

PETER J. RAHILL

Church of Saint Raymond
Saint Louis

The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume 13. Edited by Julian P. Boyd. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1956. Pp. xxxi, 664. $10.00.)

We here welcome Volume 13 of the Princeton University Press' prodigious efforts to put the Jefferson Papers between hard covers. A fifty-two-

volume series is the goal, all under the superb editorship of Julian P. Boyd. A monumental task it is, as Jefferson holds indisputable title as the most erudite and diversified political figure this country has ever had. The series will hold the 18,000 letters written by Jefferson as well as the more than 25,000 written to him on subjects as widely scattered as methods for improving the moldboard plough—which was to be one of Jefferson's most important contributions to human welfare—to scholarly treatises on the natural rights of man.

Volume 13 begins late in March, 1788, and concludes on October 7 of the same year. If the reader can imagine a tightly edited, closely printed book of some 664 pages merely to cover a six-month period in Jefferson's life, he can grasp some measure of the task confronting the editors. At this time Jefferson was still in Amsterdam with Adams negotiating with Dutch bankers for a loan to carry the debt burden of the new nation until the proposed Constitution could be written and ratified. The present volume includes Jefferson's voluminous notes made during his trip through the wine growing country of Germany and France. Here he records his first ideas for improving the moldboard plough, later to prove a major boon to the industry. Of particular interest are the many reports that Jefferson received from America concerning the debate over the new Constitution. Those from Madison, and Jefferson's replies concerning both men's ideas on the necessity for civil rights guarantees in the new document, strike the particularly Jeffersonian note on the wisdom of protecting man against the possible excesses of government, even a democratic one. Also pictured here is Jefferson's continued efforts to get "a good press" for America in Europe and his efforts to widen the basis of Franco-American trade. Those wanting an insight into a mind, now profound, now full of light wit, a mind always alive, equally at home in the world of wine, seeds, plants, and constitutional law would do well to browse here.

GILBERT L. ODDO

Mount Saint Mary's College
Emmitsburg

Profiles in Courage. By John F. Kennedy. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1957. Pp. xix, 266. $3.50.)

Profiles in Courage is an intriguing narrative about courageous decisions made by American legislators in moments of political crisis or at points where their careers were placed in jeopardy. Directed to the American public and its stake in understanding the exigencies of political action, the central premises maintained by Senator Kennedy are that only "in the political profession is the individual expected to sacrifice all—including his own career," and that the highest form of political courage

is found in that legislator who is ready to defy, when necessary for the national good, "the angry power of the very constituents who control his future." The thesis is propounded that it is "on national issues, on matters of conscience which challenge party and regional loyalities, that the test of courage is presented." These brief silhouettes range from a morose John Quincy Adams defending Jefferson's embargo against the furious onslaughts of Federalist New England to an ebullient Thomas Hart Benton despising the "bubble popularity" in the critical years of the slavery controversy. The heroes of these exciting, if sometimes melodramatic, sketches include Daniel Webster, Sam Houston, Edmund G. Ross, Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus Lamar, George Norris, and Robert Taft.

Popular in aim and style as well as technique, emphasis is placed on the colorful anecdote, on political oratory, and on expletives. Some annoying questions, of course, come to mind. Were *all* the Radicals so devoid of principle and so completely ruthless that they sought President Johnson's conviction only because of vengeance or political expediency? Is not the visionary, the idealist, the radical, or the reactionary also capable of the highest form of sacrifice and courage? Are not equally courageous acts to be found at the state and local level, or in executive and judicial ranks? Is Webster treated as magnanimously as the others? But these profiles are written in the popular vein and are hardly subject to the more severe canons of historical criticism.

Spotlighting the highly patriotic and moral act of standing on principle, even at the cost of political annihilation, the book offers to the general public an entertaining and challenging introduction to some of the controversies which evoked a spirit of dedication even in the most dismal periods of partisan conflict and corrupt government. This best-selling, prize-winning array of silhouettes, while adding little to our knowledge or understanding of the American past, serves an admirable purpose in awakening and stimulating the reading public's enthusiasm for the lure and the inspiration of history.

JOHN RICKARDS BETTS

Boston College

The Nation's Advocate, Henry Marie Brackenridge and Young America. By William F. Keller. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press. 1956. Pp. x, 451. $5.00.)

In his preface the author states that the biography of Henry Marie Brackenridge, "as it relates the events of his long life (1786-1871) records the growth of the United States." The story which is unfolded in a well written and interesting manner is that of a man who began his career as a lawyer, moved into Louisiana Territory where his writings made him

something of an early authority on this area, had a writing acquaintance with Thomas Jefferson, became a personal friend of Andrew Jackson in the early government of Florida, took an active interest in Latin American affairs, and after a prominent career as a judge in West Florida returned to Pennsylvania in 1832 to become a "cultural force in Western Pennsylvania" until his death in 1871 (p. 364). By far the greater part of the book deals with his life prior to 1832, an arrangement which is probably dictated by the sub-title inclusion of the limiting phrase, "Young America." Yet, this reader feels that the last chapter which alone deals with the period after 1832 could have been somewhat expanded at the expense of some of the innumerable detail of the early chapters which at times obscure the picture of the man.

Some insight into the character of Brackenridge can be gained from his answers to questions proposed to him as a member of the Delphian Club in 1817. In answer to the question that "if the Articles of the Decalogue were to be reduced in number, which of them could be dispensed with in civil society," he replied that "society could dispense with the Sabbath without suffering inconvenience," since the commandment was "chiefly political" and the Greeks and the Romans never observed the Sabbath (p. 171). He added, "There is also another commandment, however, which may be entirely dispensed with: 'love thy neighbor as thyself'—for that which is never practiced, which is impossible, considering human nature, to be put into practice, ought to be dispensed with" (p. 172).

While the biography does reflect some of the main problems of the age in which its subject lived, there are too many issues which Brackenridge seems to have missed or been interested in only slightly to justify the assertion that his long life records the growth of the United States. Such items as nativism and slavery, e.g., are omitted from the index and treated slightly if at all in the text. The author comments that he has kept "scholarly trappings" to a minimum without neglecting to cite all sources of information. He further notes that he has constructed the bibliography and index with the "general reader as well as the scholar in mind." On the whole the biography is well done but the author's sympathy for Brackenridge did not rub off on this reader.

DONALD P. GAVIN

John Carroll University

The German-Language Press in America. By Carl Wittke. (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press. 1957. Pp. vi, 311. $6.50.)

The mere name of Carl Wittke vouches for the reliability of this book. Over a period of twenty years or more he has read the files of more

than thirty of America's German-language papers. "The German press," he says in the preface, "was the most numerous, and in many respects, the best edited and most influential among all the foreign-language organs which served the many immigrant nationality groups of America's cosmopolitan population." With so vast a field to explore and to exploit, the author had to limit himself rigorously in digesting and presenting his findings. "The present volume," he explains, "is not so much a complete chronicle of the German press in the United States, in the sense that it tries to follow the individual fortunes of hundreds of papers, but rather the story of their importance in the history of German immigration . . . my emphasis has been primarily upon the role which the German press and its readers played in American social, political, and economic history."

Wittke has hewn to his line. Instead of producing a massive reference work somewhat akin to Ayer's, he has produced a highly readable book. In the opinion of the reviewer, his findings are not revolutionary—not even startling. This may have been one of the reasons that impelled him to dispense largely with footnotes. It was Benjamin Franklin who published the first German newspaper, the *Philadelphische Zeitung*, in 1732. Though this promptly foundered and perished, seven years later Christopher Sauer launched a like experiment at Germantown, and eventually "there were five fairly successful German papers in Pennsylvania before the Revolution." In passing Wittke makes the stimulating observation that the delivery of pioneer newspapers was problematic owing to the fact that there were only seventy-five post offices in the entire United States in 1790.

Obviously when German immigration increased in the 1830's the number of potential subscribers to German newspapers grew apace. Somewhat later the Forty-Eighters flooded the field of journalism with ebullient, albeit immature, editors, and "by 1850 New York had four German dailies—more than either Berlin or Leipzig supported at the time." Peak prosperity, however, was reserved for the era between 1875 and 1900 when the editors adopted many of the techniques of American publishers realizing that they themselves were actually producing *American* newspapers in a foreign tongue. Now that the German-American press has almost vanished, Professor Wittke has memorialized it as a major factor in first acquainting foreigners with their adopted fatherland and then later in gradually Americanizing them.

BENJAMIN J. BLIED

St. John the Baptist Church
Fond du Lac

A History of American Magazines, 1885-1905. By Frank Luther Mott. (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 1957. Pp. xvii, 858. $12.50.)

Magazines in the Twentieth Century. By Theodore Peterson. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1956. Pp. x, 457. $6.50.)

Although the history of the magazine (or serial) goes back to the early 1700's, the post-Civil War period in the United States has seen this type of graphic record become a special phenomenon of printing and publishing. It has been estimated that over a half million titles are now being published; the Library of Congress records almost one-third of a million current and expired titles. Availability of woodpulp paper, mechanical composition, and casting of type, speedy cylinder presses, and the invention of photoengraving supplied the technical advances which enabled the rising group of publishers to exploit, with the indispensable financial aid of advertising, the expanding mass markets developing in the cities toward the end of the nineteenth century. When the states had been linked by the transcontinental railroad the market for industrial products also became national.

The two books under review complement each other remarkably well. Professor Mott's volume, the fourth in a series begun in 1930, follows the pattern established earlier. There is a broad opening survey of the new trends within these two decades: "Magazines and Newspapers as Popular Interpreters"; "The Advent of the Great Ten-Cent Magazine"; "Newsstand Sales"; "Pioneer Automotive Advertising"; "Payment of Authors"; "Magazine to Book"; "Local and Regional Magazines"; "Literary Types and Judgments"; "The Graphic Arts," etc. Following these are chapters offering a horizontal cross-section of magazines by subject categories, as education, religion and philosophy, general science and medicine, women's activities, etc. Finally, the "Supplement," which comprises half the book, has thirty-four detailed vertical-type case histories of periodicals which either were founded or died in this period (e.g., *Andover Review, Munsey's Magazine,* etc.) or which underwent a drastic change (e.g., *Saturday Evening Post*). Above all this is the period when the low-priced magazine began and when national advertising made it possible to achieve the anomaly of newsstand prices of five and ten cents though production costs per copy were often double and triple those figures. Editorially, the attainment of mass-market circulation was achieved by a broadening of content; here one of the great pioneers was Irish-born S. S. McClure who developed in 1902 "a new pattern of magazine journalism that was to become immediately and spectacularly important," that arraignment of American characters and institutions known as "muckraking." The new technique,

coupled with intensive use of half-tone engraving (the opening June, 1893, issue of *McClure's Magazine* carried about fifty halftones among its 100 illustrations), brought the mass appeal that attracted 150 pages of advertising by December, 1895. Popular articles and pictures were to become characteristic of the mass circulation magazines of the twentieth century, culminating in such successes as the *Saturday Evening Post* and *Life*.

In the thirty-four case histories Mott is succinctly descriptive and critical; his analyses of the editorial techniques and formulas of men like Edward William Bok of the *Ladies Home Journal* and of George Horace Lorimer of the *Saturday Evening Post* are superb. In each account of the individual magazines Mott notes the leading authors, e.g., G. K. Chesterton as a contributor to *Cosmopolitan*, the *Forum*, *McClure's*, and the *Saturday Evening Post;* in the latter GKC began his Father Brown stories in 1910. The twentieth-century American magazine publisher was making a belated financial return to foreign authors for the unconscionable book pirating of the nineteenth century begun by Mathew Carey. While Mott already is "definitive" as a broad synthesis, further work remains in specialized areas as in religion. Slips show up occasionally, e.g., in referring to the *American Catholic Review* (p. 298) when the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* is meant (cf. v. 3, p. 68). His reference to the *Rosary* as a juvenile magazine (whose "contributors . . . did not 'write down' to their young readers"; p. 275) is obviously based on a misinterpretation of the term "Children of the Rosary," used in the first issue. One title certainly deserving of mention is the highly popular *Young Catholic Messenger* of Dayton, Ohio (1956 circulation of 665,825) founded in 1885, and, therefore, within this volume's scope. But considering the range of titles the number of errors is remarkably low.

Peterson in *Magazines in the Twentieth Century* is primarily interested in the "commercial magazines edited for the lay public." His aim has been "to explore the major tendencies in the magazine industry and the social and economic forces which helped to shape them," such as America's "transition from an agrarian to an industrial economy," and the development of a national consumer market linked with a tremendous expansion in advertising. His approach stresses circulation figures, advertising and profit-loss statements, but analyses of editorial formulae are by no means absent. Much of his material has been assembled from correspondence with publishers and from specialized articles in the printing trade publications; hence the data has a remarkable freshness. Considerable attention is devoted to market research techniques; a high positive correlation of magazine readership with educational level is adduced (p. 52). To this reviewer one of the most interesting portions is that showing close interrelationship between publication of popular magazines and paperback

books, both using the same distribution channels such as American News Company. Mr. Peterson's estimate that there are only about 300 leading magazine writers, as of 1955, with less than 100 of these earning $10,000 annually is amazing.

Magazines in the Twentieth Century, like that of Mott's work which even carries the 1957 obituary of *Colliers*, is remarkably up-to-date, bringing the story down to July, 1956, when *American* suspended. Of particular value is his analysis of the new trends; he refers to one group as "The Missionaries," viz., *Reader's Digest*, *Time*, the *New Yorker*, and the Bernarr Macfadden Publications. Obviously the term missionary like that of "miracle" has lost its religious meaning, being replaced by the concept of faith in free enterprise. The second class, that of "The Merchants," is represented by the Condé Nast Publications (such as *Vogue*), *Esquire*, and *Coronet*, the Fawcett, and the Dell Publications. Comic and crime titles are within this category. Peterson shows that many of the titles had more of an impact on social standards than on political opinions; even the venerable *Saturday Evening Post* lost face in the political field to the discomfiture of the great Lorimer. The effect of "romantic" love stories and ads on the mores of marriage cannot be analyzed but hardly denied.

One small and curious error occurs when Peterson states that in 1900 there were "only 210 libraries, including those of schools and societies" (p. 46). According to *Statistics of Public Libraries in the United States and Canada* [(Washington, 1893), p. 4], there were in 1891 in the United States alone, 3,804, of which 2,630 had fewer than 5,000 volumes. By 1908 there were 2,298 with 5,000 volumes or more. A mistaken interpretation likewise appears when Peterson states that the *Commonweal* "frequently disagreed with the official position of the Catholic church on political and social issues. Liberal in outlook, it professed to be an open forum for writers of many religious faiths or even of no faith at all" (p. 354). The author obviously does not appreciate the latitude of opinion possible to Catholic writers on these matters.

In conclusion it should be said that both of these histories are superbly designed and printed. The bibliographical apparatus in Mott is more impressive than that of Peterson and the Mott index appears to this reviewer as slightly better. These two surveys belong together. They definitely enrich historical literature, provide much-needed evaluations of a field incredibly complex and ever-shifting, and open avenues of further exploration.

EUGENE P. WILLGING

The Catholic University of America

A History of Chicago. Volume III, *The Rise of a Modern City, 1871-1893.* By Bessie Louise Pierce. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1957. Pp. xxxvi, 575. $8.50.)

In 1871 much of commercial and industrial Chicago was destroyed by fire. In 1893 Chicago, second city in the nation in population, staged the World's Columbian Exposition and thereby gave evidence that she was one of the most important cities in the world. How was this done, in approximately twenty years? That is the question that Dr. Pierce undertakes to answer in the third volume of her proposed four-volume history of Chicago. To say simply that she has succeeded is practically an understatement. Aided by an impressive staff and by substantial financial grants, she has done much more than the individual researcher could do. As one reads a volume of this sort, one wonders if possibly the day is over for the individual historian who must work alone, unaided by a staff and by financial aid. Surely no one person could have produced a book as good as this one, considering the topic involved. The account of the fire, based on over thirty individual accounts, is excellent. Although only half of the $200,000,000 loss was covered by insurance, not all of which was paid, new buildings worth over $40,000,000 were constructed in 1872, the year following the fire. This was indicative of what was to be done in the period from 1871 to 1893.

There are excellent chapters in this volume on the grain trade, the lumber trade, livestock, meat packing, etc., all heavily documented with statistical tables. Only in Chicago, it seemed, could a ditch-digger become a meat packer and make $25,000,000 in fifteen years. Philip D. Armour did precisely that, one success story among thousands. The seamy side of the story is told in the chapter, "Labor's Quest for Security." Excellent, well documented versions are given of the strikes of 1877 and 1886. Even today sections of this chapter make unpleasant reading. The fear that a few industrial workers might somehow be able to precipitate a bloody insurrection of the entire working class, seemed to galvanize public opinion against even an appearance of fairness to those on trial following the Haymarket Riot of 1886. Chicagoans of today are ashamed of the judicial murders committed as a result of this so-called trial. Many appendices, a rich bibliography, and a detailed index supplement the narrative of the text.

Loyola University
Chicago
PAUL KINIERY

Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power. By Howard K. Beale. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1956. Pp. xxi, 600. $6.00.)

These Albert Shaw lectures of 1953, revised and expanded, afford the most thorough description of Theodore Roosevelt's highly personal diplo-

macy. To an elaborately worked text there is an appendage of 116 pages of footnotes, something which creates in the reader, even one who has to begin with some notion of the extent of the sources, an impulse to applaud—when he is not expressing annoyance at the cumbersome arrangement. Equally impressive is the list of acknowledgments of printed sources, which is displayed along with an array of tributes to persons, contemporaries of TR who were still alive when Professor Beale began his meticulous researches. After "several years of preparation of a biography of Theodore Roosevelt," the invitation to give these lectures gave the author a chance to answer publicly some questions having to do with the American dynamo's impact on world affairs. The result is a unique Roosevelt-centered narrative which, although it does not answer all of the questions raised, does provide some correctives to existing studies of specific phases of our diplomatic history.

In general the Beale approach has served to rehabilitate, to show that TR was, indeed, a major influence in international affairs and not just a pretentious meddler, and that there was more to his policies than a mere expression of nationalist egoism or a romantic attachment to national power. But the effect is modified by the author's anxiety to avoid any identification of his own with the basic assumptions shared by President Roosevelt and most of the European statesmen of the first decade of this century. That they might have been wiser in their own generation is a conclusion he cannot bring himself to accept. Nevertheless, in guiding American foreign policy it is "clear that [Roosevelt's] comprehension of the problems was extraordinary, and his ability in dealing with them was superior to that of most presidents and secretaries of state." One is inclined to agree and to cite in evidence some of the best passages in this volume, those having to do with the Portsmouth peace conference and the first Moroccan crisis, which, in so far as they focus upon Roosevelt's personal diplomacy, are the best this reviewer has had the good fortune to read. For the whys and wherefors of the president's success in dealing with the rulers of the great powers of that age Professor Beale treats admirably of the advantages of TR's family background and early training, his acquaintance with the great and near great of the age, and his discernment as regards the element of power in international affairs. He had a patrician's appreciation of the civilization he felt called upon to preserve against a general war, and he used terms current in that age, like Anglo-Saxon supremacy, without sharing the more vulgar presuppositions about race. The same impressions have been felt by readers of the recently published *Letters* edited by Elting Morison.

After having vindicated Theodore Roosevelt as a constructive statesman in such a scholarly fashion, Professor Beale is bothered by his own conviction that diplomacy in that bygone era was based upon a faulty appre-

ciation of the uses of a balance of power, revealed excessive regard for national interests, and was bedeviled by imperialism. His preoccupations with supposedly inexorable events, e.g., the questionable statement, "there has been a certain inexorability about the sequence of events from World War I to the present" (p. vii), persuade him into framing questions he cannot answer, such as, "How did America get started down this road?" or trying to assess the role of the individual in relation to "blind forces." Finally, the attempt to grasp too much from his material brings him to the dangerous point of attributing too much responsibility for present conditions in international affairs to attitudes and policies of fifty years ago.

JOHN T. FARRELL

The Catholic University of America

LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

Communism in Latin America. By Robert J. Alexander. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1957. Pp. x, 449. $9.00.)

Although it began only in the 1920's, the story of organized international communism in Latin America is already a complex and richly varied one. It is this story, heretofore unaccountably neglected in the United States, that Mr. Alexander, a member of the economics faculty at Rutgers and widely traveled in Latin America, tells in his new book. Following several chapters dealing with introductory and background material, the author undertakes a country by country history of communist infiltration. It is here that complexity and variety emerge. One who has not devoted serious study to Latin America is apt to become lost in the myriad of details, dates, and names as Professor Alexander describes the initial founding of communist parties, the changes in name, the splintering movements, and the rapidly fluctuating policies pursued by communists in their relations with both left wing non-Marxian groups and rightist dictators. The most valuable portions of these surveys are those which relate the vicissitudes of the communist parties from 1920 to 1945. In these sections the book prodigally spews forth information previously difficult to come by. The treatment of the post-1945 period is more sketchy, but this is undoubtedly unavoidable, as it would take the CIA rather than the conventional methods of scholarship to ferret out the details of the more recent communist conspiracies. At least there is the reassuring picture of a decline in the communists' fortunes within the last ten years, following their successes of the World War II period when, by wholeheartedly backing the efforts of the United Nations after Germany's attack on Russia, they

reached the peak of their popularity and power. The communist menace, the author feels, is most serious today in Brazil and Chile.

Professor Alexander calls attention to the social revolution which has occurred in most of Latin America during the twentieth century, suggesting that the ability of the communists to utilize the forces unleashed by this revolution will determine their ultimate fate. Their efforts can be brought to a standstill, he believes, by indigeneous, democratic movements dedicated to the attainment of social justice. This reviewer would take partial exception to such a thesis. Unquestionably, Latin American governments must have a highly developed and sincere social consciousness if they are to stem communism. But must they all, at the present time, be democratic? In democratic Uruguay, Costa Rica, and Chile the communists at one time made some of their most significant gains. That they are now descending in importance in these countries cannot be attributed to increasing democracy, but rather to over-all conditions operative throughout Latin America which have set back the communists even in dictator-controlled countries. Peron, with his appeal to the poorer classes, was, as Alexander admits, one of the most effective foes of communism in Latin America, and other dictators have, perhaps, made similar contributions. It is impossible to impose a fully developed system of social justice upon a weak, unbalanced, and underdeveloped economy. Dictators often do more to achieve the requisite sound economy than the utopian democratic reformers who wish to do all things at once.

Stemming from Professor Alexander's intolerance of undemocratic administrations is his advice that the United States, in the interest of effectively combating communism, avoid friendly relations with dictators. This advice is not as simple to follow as it sounds. Once the United States has extended recognition to any regime, it would be difficult for it to curtail the ordinary amount of friendly exchange which customarily accompanies recognition, especially if the regime is punctilious in meeting its international obligations. Even if the attempt were made unilaterally to limit manifestations of friendship, it would throughout Latin America bring against the United States charges of intervention, thereby counteracting all the benefits deriving from the Good Neighbor Policy of non-intervention, and furnishing an ideal target for new blasts of communist propaganda. As the author points out, communist parties generally undergo an official split *vis-à-vis* dictatorships, with one part opposing, another supporting the strong man. Imagine the accusations of intervention the pro-dictator segment could hurl if the United States were to seek in any way to undermine the dictator's position! It is also a great oversimplification to assume, as Alexander appears to do, that sale of arms by the United States to dictators is one of the main reasons for the presence of authoritarian administrations in Latin America. Historical

investigation does not support this myth, one that has been widely spread by many Latin American liberals seeking a scapegoat upon which to shower the blame for certain unwelcome characteristics that are actually indigeneous to their country. The majority of Latin Americans, however, probably prefer their dictatorships to any Yankee intervention, regardless of how subtly it might be exercised. They are, furthermore, in the opinion of many qualified observers, not so devoted to the cause of full and immediate democracy as Professor Alexander believes.

Whether agreeing or not with the author's central thesis, one must applaud his diligence and skill in interviewing hundreds of persons in Latin America, and in poring over countless newspapers and communist publications in order to obtain the valuable information which he presents in this book. His efforts may also spur others to investigate the rich field, for there is still much to be written on the subject. The present volume, e.g., neglects totally the ideological clashes which may have been behind some of the inner party struggles; it does not describe the contributions to and deviations from official Marxian ideology of Carlos Mariátegui and others; it does not deal with the potential importance of increasing Latin American trade with iron curtain countries; it does not consider possible justification of the Department of State for its recent Latin American policy; and it was published too soon to appraise the effects upon Latin American communists of the downgrading of Stalin.

FREDRICK B. PIKE

University of Notre Dame

NOTES AND COMMENTS

An American division of the *Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, founded at Rome in 1929, has been established at Saint Louis University. Responsibility will be assumed by the division for the editing of documentary collections pertaining to the history of the Jesuits in North America, two of which are in the process of preparation: *Monumenta Marylandiae* which will be edited by Francis X. Curran, S.J., of Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, New York, and *Monumenta Californiae Inferioris* to be edited by Ernest J. Burrus, S.J., of Saint Louis University, John A. Donohue, S.J., of Loyola University, Los Angeles, and Esteban Palomera of the Colegio San José, Guadalajara, Mexico. Similar documentary collections are projected for the northern missions of colonial Mexico, those of New France, and those dealing with the early years of the several Jesuit provinces in the United States. The American division will be under the direction of Father Burrus, who will have serving with him as an advisory board John Francis Bannon, S.J., Lowrie J. Daly, S.J., Martin F. Hasting, S.J., and Edward R. Vollmar, S.J., all of Saint Louis University, as well as Jerome V. Jacobsen, S.J., of Loyola University, Chicago, W. Eugene Shiels, S.J., of Xavier University, Cincinnati, and Charles E. Ronan, S.J., of the University of Detroit.

On October 27 there will be formally launched the year-long celebration of the centennial of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt. Headquarters of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission established by Congress will be at 28 East 20th Street, New York, in the brownstone house where he was born on October 27, 1858. Chairman of the commission is the Vice President of the United States and the vice chairman is Joseph C. O'Mahoney, United States Senator from Wyoming. There probably was no president of this country who had more active contacts and friendships among American Catholics than Roosevelt. A cursory examination of the indices of the eight-volume *Letters of Theodore Roosevelt* edited by Elting E. Morison and John M. Blum (Cambridge, 1951-1954) makes that clear. And the recent volume of Frederick J. Zwierlein, *Theodore Roosevelt and Catholics, 1882-1919* (Rochester, 1956), reviewed in our July issue, testifies to the same fact.

The Department of History at the University of Notre Dame is sponsoring a two-day symposium on October 18-19 on the general theme, "Catholicism and the American Way of Life." The first session will deal

with "The Present Position of Religion in the United States," and will hear papers by Will Herberg of Drew University, Wilhelm Pauck of Union Theological Seminary, and Francis X. Curran, S.J., of Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak. The second session on "Catholicism in the United States" will feature Raymond L. Bruckberger, O.P., of the Dominican House of Studies, River Forest, Edward E. Swanstrom of the Catholic Relief Services—N.C.W.C., and Aaron I. Abell of Notre Dame. The final session on Saturday, October 19, will treat "Unresolved Problems" and will have three papers by Raymond F. Cour, C.S.C., of the University of Notre Dame, Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., of Loyola University, New Orleans, and Jerome G. Kerwin of the University of Chicago.

The Society of American Historians is again offering the Francis Parkman Prize of $500 for a book published within the calendar year 1957, the selection to be made by a committee of three. The volume may deal with any aspect of colonial or national history of what is now the United States, and colonial history is interpreted to embrace a treatment of the English, French, or Spanish backgrounds provided they are definitely connected with the colonies. Literary, religious, economic, political, scientific and technological, legal and constitutional history, and the history of foreign relations all come within the scope of the award. Further information may be secured by writing to Dr. Rudolf A. Clemen, Society of American Historians, Inc., Princeton University Library, Princeton, New Jersey.

The completion and publication of a supplement to Seymour De Ricci's *Census of Medieaval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* is being undertaken by the Bibliographical Society of America. Descriptions of manuscripts should be sent to Dr. W. H. Bond, Curator of Manuscripts in the Houghton Library of Harvard University, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts. The deadline for receipt of additional material is January 1, 1958.

Last May the Fund for the Advancement of Education (655 Madison Avenue, New York 21, New York) published the report of a special committee which was entitled *The Role of Education in American History*. It was the result of a series of discussions of a five-man group and was written by Richard J. Storr of the University of Chicago who has been at work for some time on a history of that institution. This report takes the historical guild to task for its neglect of American educational history.

It should have particular relevance for Catholic historians, for since the two volumes of the late James A. Burns, C.S.C., appeared in 1908 and 1912, there has been relatively little published to tell the history of Catholic education in the United States, aside from a number of doctoral dissertations at the Catholic University of America. In the current discussion about the lack of Catholic intellectuals much more information about Catholic education in this country during the twentieth century is needed. Statistics concerning Catholic schools and colleges are important, but they do not come near to telling the full story. Above all, these statistics do not bring out the psychological handicaps, the aids, and the financial and administrative problems of Catholic higher education. Here, then, is a rich field for research where there is badly needed for the American Church thorough studies like that of Fergal McGrath, S.J., of University College, Dublin, called *Newman's University, Idea and Reality* (London, 1951) which was originally a doctoral dissertation at Oxford. A number of our institutions have now reached a very respectable age and it is time that something beyond commemorative brochures and jubilee booklets be done on their history. One is reminded of this fact when it is recalled that the second oldest Catholic institution of higher education in the United States, Mount Saint Mary's College at Emmitsburg, Maryland, will celebrate this coming year its sesquicentennial.

The first issue of a new journal called *Modern Age. A Conservative Review* appeared in July. The editor is Russell Kirk and the associate editor is David S. Collier. In the initial number the editors define "conservative" as meaning "a journal dedicated to conserving the best elements in our civilization . . ." They further say: "Our purpose is to stimulate discussion of the great moral and social and political and economic and literary questions of the hour, and to search for means by which the legacy of our civilization may be kept safe" (p. 2). *Modern Age* will doubtless have relevance for many readers of our REVIEW, and in this first issue they will be particularly interested in the article of Frederick W. Wilhelmsen on "History, Toynbee and the Modern Mind: Betrayal of the West." The annual subscription is $3.00 and the journal will be published quarterly by the Foundation for Foreign Affairs, Inc., 64 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago 4, Illinois, to which all correspondence should be addressed.

The new review, *L'Orient Syrien,* devoted to the churches which use the Syriac tongue, can be obtained in the United States through Mrs. Fred Tesseine, 2114 Tenway Drive, S.E., Grand Rapids 6, Michigan, at an annual subscription of $3.50.

Wilhelm Niesel's, *The Theology of Calvin* is now obtainable in an American edition (Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1957).

V. J. K. Brook's, *Whitgift and the English Church* (London, English Universities Press, 1957), may be called to the attention of those who have been reading of this Elizabethan archbishop in the third volume of Father Philip Hughes', *The Reformation in England,* or in Powel Mills Dawley's, *John Whitgift and the English Reformation* (Scribner's, 1954).

A detailed history of Puritanism and its forms of worship between 1660-1688 may be found in G. R. Cragg's, *Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution* (Cambridge University Press, 1957). The same press also announces the first two volumes of *The New Cambridge Modern History,* i.e., *The Renaissance* (vol. I), edited by G. R. Potter, and *The Old Regime* (vol. VII), edited by J. O. Lindsay. The entire project is under the direction of an advisory committee consisting of Sir G. N. Clark, J. R. M. Butler, and J. P. T. Bury.

Leonard von Matt has added to his exquisite photographic studies of Pope Pius X, Ss. Francis of Assisi and Ignatius Loyola, a new book of the same nature, done in collaboration with Francis Trochu, entitled *St. Bernadette* (London: Longmans; Chicago: Regnery), which recounts the life of the peasant girl to whom the Blessed Mother appeared at Lourdes almost one hundred years ago.

Readers of the REVIEW who are familiar with the careful scholarship of David Knowles, regius professor of modern history in the University of Cambridge, will welcome the publication for 3s6d by the Athlone Press (2 Gower Street, London, W.C. 1, England) of the Creighton Lecture for 1956 which was entitled *Cardinal Gasquet As An Historian.* This handsomely printed brochure of twenty-six pages is a beautifully balanced essay in which Gasquet's merits and faults are all carefully measured and weighed. The famous assaults of Coulton upon the cardinal's books are also treated, and the author is fully aware of the debt Gasquet owed to Edmund Bishop, even if he is not able to be very precise as to how much of the former's work was due to Bishop's research. At the close of this engaging essay there is quoted Macaulay's remark after viewing a portrait of Warren Hastings: "He looked like a great man, and he did not look like a bad man." To this Father Knowles adds: "Gasquet was not a great man; he had neither the power nor the depth of greatness. But to those who knew him he was not, in any normal sense of the words, a bad man" (p. 26).

William D'Arcy, O.F.M.Con., professor of church history in St. Anthony-on Hudson, Rensselaer, New York, from 1945 to 1947, was named provincial of the eastern province of the Conventual friars in July. Father D'Arcy took his graduate work at the Catholic University of America where his Ph.D. dissertation was entitled *The Fenian Movement in the United States, 1858-1886* (Washington, 1947). During the past decade he has served his order in various administrative posts, having had two years, 1947-1949, as assistant to the general in Rome.

Mother Mary Peter Carthy, O.S.U., former dean and professor of history in the College of New Rochelle, was named president of the college in early July. Mother Peter did her undergraduate work at New Rochelle and took her graduate training at the Catholic University of America where she majored in the history of the American Church. She is the author of *Old St. Patrick's, New York's First Cathedral* (New York, 1947) which was originally her thesis for the master's degree and of an unpublished manuscript entitled "The English Influence on American Catholicism, 1790-1850," her dissertation for the Ph.D. degree.

Sister M. Aurelia Altenhofen, O.P., professor of history in Edgewood College of the Sacred Heart since 1953, was named president of Rosary College during the past summer. Sister Aurelia took her A.B. degree at Rosary in 1923 and in 1936 earned the Ph.D. degree at the University of Wisconsin where her thesis was on "Trade Relations between the United States and Spain during the Napoleonic War." From 1945 to 1953 she served as dean of Rosary College to which she has now returned after an absence of four years at the Dominican Sisters' college in Madison.

M. A. Fitzsimons of the University of Notre Dame, editor of the *Review of Politics*, was chosen as a member of the American delegation to the Conference on the North Atlantic Community that met at Bruges on September 8-15 and which was sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania and the College of Europe.

Among the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Fellows for 1957 are two members of the Association, viz., Oscar Halecki of Fordham University who will study the contributions of the Slavic and eastern European nations to western European culture, and Ernst M. Posner of the American University who will do research on the history of archives administration. Among the other grantees was Ernest J. Burrus, S.J., of Saint Louis University who will seek out documents in Italian archives pertaining to Latin American history.

Henry J. Browne of Cathedral College, New York, will be on leave during the academic year 1957-1958 to fill a Fulbright appointment to the University of Rome where he will study Italian immigration.

Donald R. Penn has been appointed acting chairman of the Department of History at Georgetown University. Professor Tibor Kerekes, for many years chairman of the department, has recovered sufficiently from a recent heart attack to continue teaching on a limited schedule.

New appointments at Georgetown include: W. K. Lee and Harrison Smith as associate professors in European history and J. Joseph Huthmacher as instructor in American history.

Joseph E. Kennedy, S.J., is acting head of the Department of History in Wheeling College, the youngest of the Jesuit colleges.

Raymond T. McNally has recently joined the faculty of John Carroll University, Cleveland, as an instructor in European history with special emphasis on Czarist and Soviet Russia. Dr. McNally did his undergraduate work at Fordham University, spending his junior college year at the University of Paris. He was awarded a Fulbright scholarship which enabled him to pursue his graduate studies at the Free University of Berlin where he won his doctorate with a dissertation on "The Picture of Russia in French Journalistic Writings, 1814-1843," a study which is to be published this year in the *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte.*

John B. McGloin, S.J., is on leave of absence for the fall semester from the University of San Francisco to do research in European archives on the history of the Catholic Church in California. He will return for the spring semester of 1958.

Among the new additions to the Department of History at the University of Notre Dame are John P. Dolan, C.S.C., who did his work at the University of Bonn under Hubert Jedin and whose doctoral dissertation on Georg Witzel (1501-1573) will appear in the *Corpus Catholicorum,* and Robert Burns who held a graduate assistantship at Harvard University while pursuing his studies there.

Francis J. Tschan, professor emeritus of history in Pennsylvania State University, died on July 24 at the age of seventy-six. Dr. Tschan was the eleventh president of the American Catholic Historical Association, having been elected in 1929 and having served through the year 1930 when he terminated his presidency at the annual meeting in Boston with an address entitled, "Helmold: Chronicler of the North Saxon Missions" [REVIEW, XVI (January, 1931), 379-412]. Born in Waldkirch, Breisgau, Germany, he graduated with an A.B. degree from Loyola University, Chicago, in 1901 and completed his graduate work at the University of Chicago in 1916 when he took his doctorate. At various times he taught at Loyola, the University of Chicago, Yale, and the Carnegie Institute of Technology, and in 1925 joined the faculty of what was then called the Pennsylvania State College where he remained until he retired in 1946 with the rank of professor emeritus. Among his principal publications was the translation and critical edition of *The Chronicle of the Slavs by Helmold, Priest of Bosau* (New York, 1935), the mediaeval sections of the text on *Western Civilization* (New York, 1942) which he wrote with Harold J. Grimm and J. Duane Squires, and *Saint Bernward of Hildesheim* (Notre Dame, 1942). He also held membership in numerous learned societies and for a number of years was on the executive council of the American Association of University Professors. Of the thirty-eight men who have filled the office of president of the Association since 1920 twenty-two are still living.

BRIEF NOTICES

ALLISON, A. F. and D. M. ROGERS. *A Catalogue of Catholic Books in English Printed Abroad or Secretly in England, 1558-1640.* Consisting of *Biographical Studies,* III, Nos. 3 and 4 (January and April, 1956). (Bognor Regis, England: Arundel Press. 1956. Pp. xiii, 89; 90-187).

Because of the suppression of Catholic literature of all types in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales during this period printing perforce was accomplished either on the continent, especially at St. Omer and Douai, or through a few mobile presses in England. Slightly over 930 entries are bibliographically described here with location references, up to a maximum of twelve, given to major libraries of the world. Probably as many as twenty-five per cent of the entries are new or constitute revisions of existing titles in the *Short-Title Catalogue . . . 1475-1640.* Each work was, with a half-dozen exceptions, personally collated and examined with a view toward correcting the *STC* and other bibliographies. That this will prove useful is partially shown by the fact that such printer-publishers as Pierre Auroi, Charles Boscard, John Fowler, and Roger Heigham do not appear in Guilday's work on the *English Catholic Refugees on the Continent* (London, 1914). One slight discrepancy is that the opening date is given as 1558 on the cover and 1562 in the chronological index. Bibliography of this type is now being recognized as an indispensable auxiliary tool to the historian. (EUGENE P. WILLGING)

BOWEN, CROSWELL. *The Elegant Oakey.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1956. Pp. 292. $5.00.)

Abraham Oakey Hall was Mayor of New York during the days when the Tweed Ring flourished. A dabbler at verse and dramatics, a devotee of the wisecrack and the pun, Oakey loved the limelight. The city charter of 1870 had given the incumbent mayor (Hall) power to appoint the comptroller (Richard B. Connolly); these two, plus the president of the Board of Parks (Peter B. Sweeney) and the commissioner of Public Works (William M. Tweed), constituted the Board of Audit. Did Hall gain by his association with the Tweed Ring? He was required by law to countersign vouchers authorizing payment of funds from the city treasury. As Henry Clinton pointed out in his opening address at Hall's first trial, the city debt was doubling every two years. Could Hall have been unaware of this? Tweed testified to Hall's complicity. In spite of this,

Clinton was eventually convinced that Hall was guilty only of lack of vigilance, and Mr. Bowen is of like opinion. As he says, "The courts acquited him, but the public did not" (p. 57). Perhaps, the glory of strutting on the mayoralty stage was reward enough. The cartoons of Nast and the editorials of Jennings show that they believed Hall guilty. That he was an eager aspirant to office is shown by his lack of political stability. He had been in turn Whig, Know-Nothing, Republican, Mozart Hall Democrat, and Tammany Democrat. He cultivated the Irish and German vote so assiduously as to be dubbed "Mayor Von O'Hall." At any rate, Hall's life after the trials was an anti-climax: "It is hard to be a 'has been,' as in my 70th year, I realize that I am," he was to write to Augustin Daly in 1897.

The present volume evolved from research done for an article on Hall in the *New Yorker,* and the work suffers from its origins. The author relies heavily on the scrapbooks of Hall. He could have done much more on Hall's activities during the Civil War, e.g., his sympathy for the Democratic Union Association, his speech in January, 1863, attacking Greeley and the abolitionists, his letter to their meeting on May 18, 1863, and his advocacy of McClellan for president in February, 1864. Errors mar the book and, although they are minor, they can be upsetting, e.g., Mrs. John Wook for "Wood" (p. 43), Maeth for "Meath" (p. 87); on page 214 James Gordon Bennett is received into the Catholic Church on his deathbed, whereas he had been a Catholic in his youth (p. 219) and O'Donovan Rossa is a bishop! (p. 91). Because of the subject Mr. Bowen's book is interesting, but the definitive life of Abraham Oakey Hall remains to be written. (Basil Leo Lee)

Brillant, Maurice and René Aigrain (Eds.). *Histoire des religions.* Vol. 5. (Paris: Bloud et Gay. N.d. [1957.] Pp. 386. $5.23.)

This is the last volume in *Histoire des religions.* It comprises: I, Les religions du Mexique by J. Soustelle and R. Aigrain (pp. 7-63); II, La religion dans l'Empire des Incas by L. Baudin (pp. 5-87); III, La religion des anciens Slavès by P. Pascal, followed by a short section on the religion of the Scythians and Sarmatae by R. Aigrain (pp. 89-111); IV, Les religions des Celtes by P. M. Duval (pp. 13-134); V, Les Germains by M. Boucher (pp. 135-199); VI, L'Islam by A. Vincent (pp. 201-278); VII, Le Judaïsme by A. Vincent (pp. 279-303); VIII, Naissance et mort des religions by J. Folliet (pp. 305-340); IX, Evolution de la religion by J. Goetz (pp. 341-374).

Now that the *Histoire des religions* is completed, it may be definitely characterized as uneven in quality and semi-popular in tone. However,

in each volume there are usually a few chapters or sections which will repay careful reading. In Volume 5 attention is called especially to the sections on the religions of Mexico and Peru, on that of the Germans, on Islam, and on the rise and decay of religions, and on the evolution of religion. Each volume is furnished with a *table des matières,* but there are no indices—and there are no illustrations. (MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE)

JEBB, ELEANOR AND REGINALD JEBB. *Belloc the Man.* (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press. 1957. Pp. x, 172. $3.25.)

This is a charming addition to the Belloc studies. Written by the late English historian's son-in-law and daughter, it contains a number of entertaining scenes revealing Belloc's relations with his family and friends. Belloc emerges as a humble, charitable man, his personal life directed as was his historical works—by love for the Roman Catholic Church. Eleanor Jebb relates many little events from her childhood. In these portrayals Belloc often appears as a rather elusive figure. He had a love and a sensitive understanding of children, but he was a busy man, and less is discovered about his personality in his daughter's reminiscences than might be expected. The reviewer found Reginald Jebb's portion of the book the more valuable. Here he reminds us that Belloc's mother was the daughter of Joseph Parkes of Reform Bill days, and that her mother was the granddaughter of Joseph Priestley! Belloc's disappointment at his not receiving an Oxford fellowship is recounted, with the sensible surmise that probably Belloc was not suited for the life of a don and, furthermore, his being forced into the life of a popular writer was all to the good for English letters.

Jebb's story of Belloc's experiences in Parliament and with politicians during the Marconi scandal help to explain his disillusionment with parliamentary democracy. While many of Belloc's statements are rather embarrassing to Catholic liberals of the present age, there is little doubt that his instincts were anti-authoritarian, and that he had a genuine regard for rule by the people and for the common good. Yet many will say Belloc was neither a profoundly integrated political thinker, nor historian, in spite of his insights in both fields. As a literary figure, however, he was a genius. Has any other writer of this century matched his clear, ingenious, and often extraordinarily witty prose?

While many contemporary Catholic historians may disagree with Belloc's most fundamental assertions, Jebb is correct in pointing out the influence which he continues to exercise. He immeasurably added to the

intellectual stature of Catholicism in the English-speaking world, and even among non-Catholic historians, studies of the Reformation and the seventeenth century in England have not been the same since he boldly challenged smug academic assumptions. Belloc necessarily was drawn into bitter controversies. Yet, as Jebb says, he did not allow these disputes to affect his personal friendships, and he was much troubled with Wells' coolness after the *Outline of History* debates. It was especially pleasant to read that Belloc got along very well with Jewish people, and loved their company. (FRANKLIN A. WALKER)

LAMAR, HOWARD ROBERTS. *Dakota Territory, 1861-1889: A Study of Frontier Politics.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1956. Pp. x, 304. $4.50.)

Mr. Lamar has made a study long overdue for this is the first political history of Dakota Territory and, like most first attempts, calls for further study. It is this reviewer's hope that before long the political history of the statehood of South Dakota will also be written.

The author gathered much of the information for his book from material buried in newspaper files and in archives not generally accessible to the student. The factual part of his study and the biographical data on Dakota territorial leaders will be of great help to the teacher of South Dakota history. But in his selection and interpretation of data the author is so obviously influenced by his studies of political theories and territorial systems that he appears to lose sight of the Dakota locale and climate of thought. He is so intent on tracking down "class conflicts" and political feuds that he sometimes draws wrong conclusions. A case in point is the reason given for holding the 1885 constitutional convention in September—to prevent the farmers, busily engaged with the harvest, from attending. September is not the most pressing harvest time in Dakota. The author's too frequent references to the "Yankton oligarchy," the "Broadway gang," and various "rings" probably can be traced to the picturesque language of newspaper editorials of that day. To this reviewer the author appeared unduly concerned to fit the Dakota political scene into a preconceived evolutionary pattern.

Aside from these flaws, somewhat excusable in one probably not personally familiar with the West, the author has done a commendable piece of work. The footnotes are accurate, the index adequate, the bibliography informative and critical. An appendix, containing the 1883, 1885, and 1889 constitutions, or excerpts of them, for the purpose of comparison would have enhanced the value of the book. (SISTER M. CLAUDIA DURATSCHEK)

MEEHAN, JAMES (Ed.). *Centenary History of the Literary and Historical Society of University College Dublin, 1855-1955.* (Tralee, Ireland: The Kerryman, Ltd. 1956. Pp. xxiv, 377. 21/.)

In 1854 the Catholic University of Ireland was founded in Dublin by the later Cardinal Newman. For decades it led a precarious existence, crippled by poverty and by the lack of legal recognition for its degrees. In 1879 Disraeli's government solved the latter problem by establishing the Royal University of Ireland, an examining body which conferred degrees on students educated by the Catholic University. In 1908 the Royal University was dissolved and in its place the British government established the National University of Ireland of which Newman's old college became a constituent part as University College, Dublin. This arrangement continues to the present.

In 1855 or the following year (the date is uncertain) a students' debating society was established under Newman's patronage and, except for a lapse of six years in the 1890's, it still flourishes. The Literary and Historical Society is always known simply as the "L & H" or, more phonetically, the "Ellenaitch." The society has played an important part in the education of many men prominent in Irish professional and public life. Naturally enough, its proceedings have varied from rhetorical nonsense, designed to amuse or to shock, to serious efforts such as the paper on "Drama and Life" presented in 1900 by James Joyce. Apart from a short section on the first fifty years of the society, the editor has devoted the bulk of the book to contributions. Each of these alumni describes the proceedings for the years that he was connected with the society. Many of the comments on colleagues who later achieved fame will be of use to future historians but, for the general reader, the detail into which such contributors must necessarily enter in a work of this kind tends to become monotonous. (MAURICE R. O'CONNELL)

MIKUS, JOSEPH A. *La Slovaquie dans le drame de l'Europe. Histoire politique de 1918-1950.* (Paris: Les Iles d'Or. 1955. Pp. 475.)

In many of their works on East Central Europe, American historians have often relied upon sources the objectivity of which is open to question. E.g., Polish history is more often seen through German or Russian eyes than as it really is. So too the history of the Slovaks is seen in Magyar or Czech hues. In the work under review Mr. Mikus overcomes this obstacle, correcting in the process many of the errors consequent upon the former interpretations. For this reason the work should stir something of a controversy as, indeed, any work that upsets a long established belief will do. But that the Czechoslovak state was no bed of roses, for the

Slovak population at least, is a condition which is slowly but surely coming to the light. A people who are contented do not plot the dissolution of the state of which they are a part.

Dr. Mikus surveys the principal Slovak grievances, the political, social, economic, and cultural discriminations which had the destruction of their national identity as their objective. He traces the temporary relief brought to this situation in the days of the Slovak Republic from its origins at the time of Munich to its collapse before the Soviet advance. Proceeding to a survey of the short lived "Third Czechoslovak Republic"—as the reign of the National Front, 1945-1948, is called—the author follows with a description of the "Fourth Czechoslovak Republic," the communist dictatorship which succeeded it. Through all these disheartening events, the hope of the Slovak peoples perseveres, that,

> Après avoir fait l'expérience de la domination magyare et tchèque, des totalitarismes allemand et soviétique . . . (ils) . . . désirent finalement être eux-mêmes et devenir non un coin obscur de la politique de Budapest ou de Prague mais un maillon valide du système fédératif européen (p. 403).

This book is scholarly and readable, well annotated, and presents many facts which are not to be found elsewhere. The bibliography is indispensable. The preface by Paul Lesourd of the Catholic Institute of Paris is an excellent overview to the latest epoch of Slovak history, the "lutte à mort entre le communisme athée et le christianisme," the latter being the very essence of the Slovak way of life. (EUGENE KUSIELEWICZ)

MULLETT, CHARLES F. *The Bubonic Plague and England.* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press. 1956. Pp. vii, 401. $9.00.)

England had her first experience with plague in 558. The first significant epidemic began in 664 and continued for about twenty-five years. Knowledge of this and later outbreaks down to the fourteenth century are scanty. While attaching great significance to the Black Death, historians have quite generally minimized the plague's career during the next two and a half centuries. In almost any of the 320 years, 1348-1668, some English community suffered. Even after England no longer harbored the pest, the threat from nearby countries induced legislative action and medical description for more than a century and a half. Not until 1897 was the rat accepted as a source of infection, and some time elapsed before the flea was recognized as a carrying agent. During all these centuries it was an open question whether the remedy or the disease most endangered the patient. Preventives and cures ranged from some purging medicine to the frequent discharge of guns. Those with ulcers had a good chance of survival because "harmful humors were drained away."

An essay of this kind in the history of preventive medicine is bound to be repetitious. Through no fault of the diligent author, the same nostrums were repeated from century to century, including the avoidance of cabbages. Greater interest attaches to the powerful impact of the plague on English society. Dr. Mullett believes that the growth of secularism in the sixteenth century owed something to the plague. Ecclesiastical prestige declined and the State moved into spheres—especially those relating to welfare—once administered by the Church.

The plague was constantly at work during the reign of Elizabeth. In the Stuart period, it simultaneously increased the cost of government and reduced government income. High mortality halted fairs, closed markets, uncertainty discouraged investment, and during the ship money crisis more than 800 were dying each week in London. The plague killed more people than Cromwell, and it moved Pepys to wonder concerning the future of periwigs because no one would buy hair for fear it came from the heads of the plague-stricken. Catholics, Jews, and "fanatics" were blamed for the plague of 1665. Lawyers found a profitable business in drawing up wills. Oxford lost scholars. An Eton schoolboy was whipped for not smoking. Dr. Mullett has given us a valuable and instructive monograph which should stimulate some revisions in modern English historiography. (JOHN J. O'CONNOR)

NOLAND, AARON. *The Founding of the French Socialist Party, 1893-1905.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1956. Pp. viii, 233. $4.50.)

This is a clear, concise, and objective study of the critical decade or so during which the various socialist groups in France were finally pulled together into a united Socialist Party. It is based upon close analysis of the primary and secondary materials available, and Dr. Noland, who is an assistant professor of history at the City College of New York, has also used the Jules Guesde Archives of the Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis in Amsterdam.

After reviewing the effects of the Commune upon French socialism, Dr. Noland analyzes the drift toward *rapprochement* of the various socialist groups in the years from 1893 to 1898, the divisive effects first produced by the Dreyfus Affair, the unifying effect then created by the attack from the right upon the Republic, the divisive effects of ministerialism when Millerand entered the government, and the ultimate unification in 1905, with the Second International playing the role of a godmother. The volume is especially good on the roles played by significant individuals, especially Guesde and Jaurès, and it is fair and accurate in its appraisals of all the groups. No one can read it, or study this period of French history, without

coming to admire the great humanity of Jaurès, or without reflecting on the decline of France and of French humanism since the death of Jaurès. The immense gap between the great achievement of 1905 and the power of the Communist Party in France today reveals that unification of the socialists was an unstable and fragile triumph.

This is a fine study, but it does not add a great deal to our knowledge of those years in general or of socialist history in particular. It also concentrates somewhat too heavily upon questions of doctrine and policy; there is no social analysis of socialism in France, and the description of the politics of the period, which are incredibly complex, is not adequate. At the same time, this book is a creditable first book from a young man who will undoubtedly contribute a great deal more to our knowledge of modern France. This volume has prepared him well for later study of the division of the socialists after World War I, the conflicts between the socialist and communist parties, and the tragic history of French labor over the past half century. (Robert F. Byrnes)

Payne, Peter Lester and Lance Edwin Davis. *The Savings Bank of Baltimore, 1818-1866: A Historical and Analytical Study.* [Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXXII, No. 2, 1954.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1956. Pp. 188. $3.00.)

This study of the Savings Bank of Baltimore opens one small chink in the great wall of financial records to reveal the influence of a single bank upon the economic life of a large American city. Since the work is both historical and analytical, it will be of interest to students of American history as well as of economics, especially to those of the latter who will find the many charts and diagrams full of provocative statistics. The authors amply demonstrate their various theses with these statistics culled from the bank's records. Although, in general, the study shows careful scholarship, there are some deficiencies. In the first place Payne and Davis do not seem to have agreed upon just what was the motivation for the establishment of the bank. For example, one reads the following: "Repeatedly, the directors stress the fact that the primary object of the Bank's portfolio policy was not profits but security, and evidence that this objective was attained is provided by the fact that the Bank did not lose money on a single investment until the failure of the Baltimore Water Company in 1854" (p. 32). Farther on the reader meets this: "In January 1819, however, the Bank invested a large proportion of its funds in United States stocks. From this date until mid-1837 the volume of the Bank's liquid assets seems to belie the directors' frequent assertions that they were interested in safety rather than profits" (p. 94). Such an important point should have had a more clear and definite analysis.

Moreover, there is the following serious admission which seems to color the entire study: "As has already been confessed, the methods used in this study make no claim to statistical elegance" (p. 58). The authors' candor is to be commended, but it is likewise puzzling to be told this in view of the fact that they indicate repeatedly that the bank records for the period studied were adequate for the analysis presented. Specifically, e.g., it is stated that "the books of the investing committee contained details of all loans made between 1818 and 1866 and these loans were numerous, the present analysis was restricted to a detailed study of the approximately 6,000 loans that were over $5,000 in amount or were granted for a period of over twelve months" (p. 114). And yet one also reads, "Although the Bank only rarely made loans to finance new businesses, these examples prove that such loans *were* made; indeed they may have been made in much greater volume than the fragmentary evidence available would indicate" (p. 134). It is the reviewer's opinion, however, that these defects do not undermine the general value of this study which adds another chapter to the expanding economic history of the United States. (Bosco D. Cestello)

Pérez de Urbel, Justo, O.S.B. *St. Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles.* Translated by Paul Barrett, O.F.M.Cap. (Westminster: Newman Press. 1956. Pp. xii, 430. $5.00.)

This contribution to Pauline literature is an outline of the apostle's life and teaching. The author follows the chronological order and portrays St. Paul against the multicolored backdrop of Asia Minor, Greece, and Rome in the middle years of the first century. Father Justo knows the period and milieu in which St. Paul worked and traveled, the mystery cults and pagan practices of the eastern Mediterranean lands, the outlook and spirit of the Jewish mind in Palestine and the Diaspora, the Jewish sects, the topography of the territories covered by St. Paul's journeys, and the customs of the cities where he sojourned. Paul's psychology and character stand out in sharp relief. The author states in his prologue that it was not his purpose to write a scholarly work or to present a systematic exposition of St. Paul's thought. "I do not offer here any historical novelty, nor do I offer anything that will enlighten the learned or surprise the specialists." He desires simply to relate the story of St. Paul in its historical setting and to exhibit his character "in all its rugged sublimity and sanctity." Thus disarmed, the critic cannot take issue with Father Justo for avoiding any discussion of the many problems that beset the writer who takes St. Paul for his subject, as well as for not advancing the reasons for the views held in this work. Within the limits set for himself, the author has accomplished his purpose.

Most of the non-scriptural citations are taken from the classical authors. The norms followed in citing these references are difficult to unearth. Only two modern authors are cited with two fairly long quotations taken from Baumann and one from Tricot. The single translator's note (p. 157) calls attention to the divergency of views on the date of the Epistle to the Galatians. The translator might well have appended other notes where similar differences exist and deserve attention as well as the above date. Two instances will suffice: the problem of the *episcopoi-presbuteroi*; and the retention of the earlier dating of the medallion of Sts. Peter and Paul which is probably wrongly attributed to the second century. The translation reads smoothly. Two end page maps and an index enhance its value. Only one typesetting error was noticed. For those who are unacquainted with St. Paul and his milieu, this work will provide a useful introduction. (JOSEPH M. O'DONNELL)

POCHMANN, HENRY A. *German Culture in America, 1600-1900. Philosophical and Literary Influences.* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1957. Pp. xv, 865. $7.50.)

As a professor of American literature, the author is chiefly interested in those German cultural contacts which have had a direct influence on his own special field (p. 15). For this reason the sub-title is a more accurate description of his work than the more inclusive "German Culture in America, 1600-1900," a title which on the face of it seems to promise a good deal more. Nevertheless, in tracking down philosophical and literary influences, Professor Pochmann does make substantial incursions into other areas of culture as well, notably the educational and religious. However, it is curious that the only religious thought he takes note of is Protestant; and that, in turn, seems to have affected only Protestants. One wonders whether German Catholicism left no mark at all on American thinking and writing.

In his preface the author informs us that the book as published represents about one-third of the original manuscript, which embodied the fruits of twenty-five years of research (p. vii). Even in this reduced form he has given us a stout volume of 865 closely-printed, double-columned pages. Of these, about 490 are devoted to his main text, followed by over 300 pages of notes in smaller type: a witness to the thoroughness of the author's scholarship. Parenthetically, this reviewer would like to register a protest against the current practice of thus separating the notes from the text to which they refer, and relegating them to the rear of the book. This fatigues the reader with a constant flipping back and forth, and subjects him to the annoyance of losing his place on the large, packed pages. Book One (pp. 19-323) deals with

"German Thought in America," principally thought of a philosophical and religious (Protestant) nature. Book Two (pp. 327-492) traces the popularity of German literature in America and "German Literary Influences" on American writers. There are six tables and a quite comprehensive index. Although a valuable contribution toward the study of American cultural development, this book will appeal mainly to the student of American literature. (VINCENT J. FECHER)

SALU, M. B. (Trans. and Ed.). *The Ancrene Riwle.* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1957. Pp. xxvii, 196. $2.75.)

This is an early thirteenth-century document written by an unknown author to direct three well born ladies who were beginning the life of anchoresses. For her excellent translation of this interesting rule Miss Salu used MS Corpus Christi College, Cambridge 402, dated 1225-30 and known as *Ancrene Wisse* or "Guide of Anchoresses," although she retained the title *Ancrene Riwle,* first used by Morton in his great edition of 1853 for the Camden Society. Interest in the *Ancrene Riwle* is historical rather than immediate, but the eight chapters into which this work is divided contain much interesting and valuable material on vocal prayers, the necessity of mortifying the senses, regulating the internal feelings, external and internal temptations, confession, the necessity of penance, love, and, as a postscript, the external rules for the anchoresses. Though the author of this rule is unknown, Dom Gerard Sitwell in his critical introduction reasons that he was probably a diocesan priest, rather than a monk or a regular canon, with a surprisingly modern style. In other ways, such as his explanation of Scripture and his preoccupation with the pastoral problems of the thirteenth century the author is a typical child of his day. This is nowhere better exemplified than in the most characteristic feature of the rule's content, the apparent disregard of contemplation, and its almost exaggerated emphasis on sin and temptation, so unlike the fourteenth-century mystics. Students of English *monastica* will be grateful to Miss Salu and to the Notre Dame Press for this modern English translation and the pleasing format. An index would have enhanced its value. (ADRIAN FUERST)

STARR, CHESTER G. (Ed.). *The Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages. Selected Essays by M. L. W. Laistner.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1957. Pp. xvii, 285. $5.00.)

Earlier this year, Professor Laistner published a new and thoroughly revised edition of his *Thought and Letters in Western Europe A.D. 500 to 900,* making that excellent work again available. The present book,

published in his honor primarily through the efforts of Mr. Starr, a former pupil and now professor of history in the University of Illinois, may be described—to quote the preface—"as a companion piece." It contains fifteen essays, articles, and review-articles dealing chiefly with mediaeval themes originally published by Professor Laistner in various journals or books, which, in part at least, are only accessible in the largest libraries. Apart from minor corrections or retouches, no changes have been made in the original texts. The long preface gives a delightfully written sketch of Professor Laistner's career and a fine personal appreciation of him as a teacher and scholar. The essays are followed by a bibliography of his publications, 1914-1956.

The essays and articles reproduced in this volume are so important that it will be well worthwhile to list them here: 1. Some Reflections on Latin Historical Writing in the Fifth Century; 2. The Value and Influence of Cassidorus' Ecclesiastical History; 3. The Influence during the Middle Ages of the Treatise *De vita contemplativa* and Its Surviving Manuscripts; 4. The Western Church and Astrology during the Early Middle Ages; 5. Ernst Robert Curtius' *Europäische Literatur und Lateinisches Mittelalter*; 6. Bede as a Classical and a Patristic Scholar; 7. The Library of the Venerable Bede; 8. The Latin Versions of Acts Known to the Venerable Bede; 9. Was Bede the Author of a Penitential?; 10. Some Early Medieval Commentaries on the Old Testament; 11. Fulgentius in the Carolingian Age; 12. A Ninth-Century Commentator on the Gospel according to Matthew; 13. Richard Bentley, 1742-1942; 14. Michael Rostovtzeff's *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*; 15. Henri-Irenée Marrou's *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*.

This volume is much more significant than the typical *Festschrift* with its hodgepodge of contributions of quite uneven value. The high quality of the essays and articles presented here reflects the broad learning and the solid, accurate, and critical scholarship which we have long become accustomed to associate with their author. (MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE)

UHLENDORF, BERNHARD A. (Trans. and Ed.). *Revolution in America: Confidential Letters and Journals, 1776-1784, of Adjutant General Major Baurmeister of the Hessian Forces.* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1957. Pp. xiv, 640. $9.00.)

This is an excellent primary source on the Revolutionary War. The author of the *Letters and Journals,* Major Baurmeister, writes an interesting description of and commentary on the Revolution in reporting to his superior, the Minister of State of Hesse-Cassel. The *Letters and Journals* are primarily military history. In this regard, Baurmeister's reports on the northern campaigns, especially on the Battle of Long Island, are

good first hand accounts of operations in this quarter. His commentaries on the South are not always reliable, a compilation of hearsay, rumor, and official reports. Here and there, though economic and political policy seem to be generally and understandably lost on this German officer, he includes information on congressional bickering, the effects of unbridled American inflation, and some economic and social conditions of the war. Baurmeister is quite descriptive of conditions in occupied New York and of British logistical problems. He continually speaks disparagingly of the fighting abilities of the American soldier and gives short-shrift to his successes at Trenton, Saratoga, and elsewhere. On the other hand, while never critical of the British, he senses their lost cause, saying, e.g., "The Americans are bold, unyielding and fearless." He observes that their indomitable ideas of liberty keep the rebellion alive, despite discouragements, He himself, disgruntled by the length of a war that is not his, desertions of his troops, many of whom imbibed these principles of liberty to remain in the new country, exclaims: "How little has been accomplished in the present war in spite of considerable losses on both sides." "The Americans are by no means conquered."

The editor has done considerable research which enhances the value of the volume, and the translation is colorful, lively, and very readable. The work is a distinct contribution to Revolutionary historical literature. (RICHARD WALSH)

VAN DEN BAAR, P. A. *Die kirchliche Lehre Translatio Imperii Romani bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts.* [Analecta Gregoriana. Vol. LXXVIII. Series Facultatis Historiae Ecclesiasticae. Sectio B (n. 12).] (Roma: Apud Aedes Universitatis Gregorianae. 1956. Pp. xxi, 152.)

Mediaeval writers never arrived at a common agreement concerning the powers and significance of the mediaeval empire in the West. A major difficulty was the source of the authority for its translation from the Greeks to the Franks and their successors. Various reasons were advocated by the writers: the military power of Charlemagne, the authority of the citizens of Rome, the failure of the Eastern Empire to provide for the defense of the Church, the political powers granted to the Bishop of Rome by the Donation of Constantine. In time a specifically clerical doctrine about the translation was evolved in which the constitutive power to make the transfer was attributed to the vicarial power of the Bishop of Rome and its purpose was the defense of the Church. In the great debates that accompanied the conflicts between the popes and the emperors from the middle of the eleventh to the middle of the thirteenth centuries, this translation of the imperial office was bound to play a large role. With Bandinelli (Alexander III) the canonists began to work out the juridical argument

in scholastic form which was adopted and elaborated by the canonist popes Innocent III, Gregory IX, and Innocent IV. In the latter phase of the evolution of this clerical doctrine the translation idea became a part of the larger body of theorizing about the hierocratic theme of all authority in the Christian world. The right to make a transfer of the empire from the Greeks to the West became an obvious corollary to the universality of the authority of the Vicar of Christ.

This study was made under the direction of the eminent mediaevalist, Friedrich Kempf, S.J. The author usually lets his sources speak for themselves. Subsequent students of this and kindred problems will bless him for his bibliography and complete text references, if not for the lack of an index. (VICTOR GELLHAUS)

WILLIAMS, FREDERICK VINCENT. *The Martyrs of Nagasaki.* (Fresno: Academy Library Guild. 1956. Pp. 145. $3.75.)

Mr. Williams presents in this brief sketch the story of the heroic Catholics of Japan who courageously endured more than 200 years of bitter persecution because of their faith. The terrible sufferings of these brave people, and their perseverance in their religion despite tremendous odds, constitute a glorious chapter in the history of the Church. The story is a fascinating one, but one which, unfortunately, is not well known, even among Catholics. The author has tried to remedy this situation by telling that story in a simple, straightforward narrative which is interesting and inspiring. He begins with a brief summary of the life of St. Francis Xavier and of his introduction of Christianity into Japan, and comes down through the long centuries of persecution to the present day. He includes also a very brief account of the history of Catholicism in Korea and Manchuria. My chief criticism of Mr. Williams' book is that he has tried to put too much into a very limited space, with the result that the narrative becomes choppy and at times disconnected. This is by no means a definitive work on the history of the Church in Japan, nor was it, I am sure, intended as such. It is to be hoped, however, that Mr. Williams' little book will stimulate the interest of historians in the subject, and will lead to some scholarly studies on the martyrs of Nagasaki. (FRANCIS L. RYAN)

WILLIAMS, T. HARRY (Ed.). *Abraham Lincoln: Selected Speeches, Messages, and Letters.* (New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc. 1957. Pp. xxi, 290. 75¢.)

This is a selection of writings and speeches which is not intended to present a "complete" Lincoln, but chosen in a way to present his views

and ideas on government. The contents are divided into six categories: early years; slavery; president-elect; 61-62; 63; 64-65. The editor, while not a professional historian—which is the rule rather than the exception—has achieved considerable fame in the field of Lincoln studies, particularly in those dealing with military problems. The book contains a fifteen-page introduction by the editor which explains the basis for the selections and gives some historical background that lends meaning to the writings. There is a selected bibliography. Mr. Williams' purpose is well accomplished by the selections. It goes without saying that the real Lincoln is seen in his speeches and writings which, of course, is not meant as any criticism of the historians. There are really two Lincoln's, viz., the historical Lincoln, a political pragmatist of the first order, and the mythical Lincoln, created by the political orators in need of a legend. It may be that too much emphasis is placed on the editions of Lincoln's works; but this may well be the result of the historians' attempt to present more clearly the historical Lincoln and to a certain degree to destroy the mythical Lincoln.

By reading the "House Divided" speech and Lincoln's letter to Speed one learns just how much he was opposed to slavery and sometimes prompts the question as to why he was not an abolitionist. But when one reads from his own pen the extent to which he would go to preserve the union, it affords a better realization of the real distinction between Lincoln and the abolitionist. The weakness of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill is more apparent by following Lincoln's quaint but forceful logic. If one is interested in the personal problems of Lincoln they will have to seek elsewhere for his evasive love letters or his blunt advice to his step-brother, since this volume deals only with his political philosophy and the most important problems of Lincoln's public life. For that reason it is both practical and economical. (THOMAS B. DUNN)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

La religión católica y la cultura. E. Guerrero (*Razón y Fe*, May, 1957).

Toutes les religions ont-elles la même valeur? A. Léonard, O.P. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, July-Aug., 1957).

Vom Geheimnis der Geschichte. L. Lenhart (*Theologische Revue*, Nr. 3, 1957).

L'histoire et les historiens. Seconde chronique de méthodologie historique. Henri-Irénée Marrou (*Revue Historique*, Apr.-June, 1957).

History and How to Write It. Dixon Wecter (*American Heritage*, Aug., 1957).

History and the Humanities. Theodore D. Lockwood (*Journal of Higher Education*, January, 1957).

Objectives and Methods in Intellectual History. John C. Greene (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, June, 1957).

A Philosophical Appraisal of the Christian Interpretation of History. Theodore M. Greene (*Pacific Historical Review*, May, 1957).

St. Mark's Philosophy of History. T. A. Burkill (*New Testament Studies*, Jan., 1957).

Arnold J. Toynbee's Philosophy of Religion. Pacificus Kennedy, O.F.M. (*Franciscan Studies*, Mar., 1957).

Toynbee et la religion. Benoît Lacroix, O.P. (*Sciences Ecclésiastiques*, Jan., 1957).

History, Toynbee, and the Modern Mind: Betrayal of the West. Frederick Wilhelmsen (*Modern Age*, Summer, 1957).

El proceso de apropiación de la libertad. Luis Rosales (*Revista de Estudios Politicos*, Mar.-Apr., 1957).

Transmigration in Plato. Erland Ehnmark (*Harvard Theological Review*, Jan., 1957).

Erodoto e la storiografia moderna: alcuni problemi presentati ad un convegno di Umanisti. A. Momigliano (*Aevum*, Jan.-Feb., 1957).

Sur quelques documents nouveaux concernant les cultes de Cybèle et d'Attis: Des Balkans à la Gaule. Ch. Picard (*Numen*, Jan., 1957).

Do We Know What Our Lord Looked Like? Dom Sylvester Houédard, O.S.B. (*Pax*, Summer, 1957).

Église primitive et communauté de Qumran. J. Daniélou (*Etudes*, May, 1957).

Die Handschriften aus der Gegend am Toten Meer. F. Nötscher (*Theologische Revue*, Nr. 2, 1957).

Remarques sur *Jerusalem? Ephese?* Cl. Kopp., J. Euzet, C.M. (*Divus Thomas, Commentarium de Philosophia et Theologia*, Jan.-Mar., 1957).

Petrus in Rom. K. Aland (*Historische Zeitschrift*, June, 1957).

St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome: The Problem of the Memoria Apostolorum ad Catacumbas. H. Chadwick (*Journal of Theological Studies,* Apr., 1957).

The Vatican Excavations and the Tomb of St. Peter. J. Gwyn Griffiths (*Hibbert Journal,* Jan., 1957).

The Vatican Excavations and the Tomb of St. Peter. Jocelyn Toynbee and J. Gwynn Griffiths (*ibid.,* Apr., 1957).

Paul's Ministry in Asia—the Last Phase. G. S. Duncan (*New Testament Studies,* May, 1957).

Irénée, *Adv. haer,* III, 3, 2, église de Rome ou église universelle? P. Nautin (*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions,* Jan.-Mar., 1957).

De civitate Dei, XV, 2 et l'idée augustinienne de la société chrétienne. F. Edward Cranz (*Revue des Études Augustiniennes,* No. 1, 1957).

The Nature of Early Christian Pacifism. John Ferguson (*Hibbert Journal,* July, 1957).

Christian Pacifism and the Way of Jesus. G. H. Boobyer (*ibid.*).

Bulletin d'histoire des doctrines chrétiennes. P. Th. Camelot (*Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques,* Apr., 1957).

Bulletin d'histoire des institutions chrétiennes. A. Duval, N. Walty (*ibid.*).

La Correspondance entre Basile de Césarée et Apollinaire de Laodicée. H. De Riedmatten (*Journal of Theological Studies,* Oct., 1956, Apr., 1957).

Note sur la correspondance de Barlaam évèque de Gerace avec ses amis de Grèce. R. J. Loenertz, O.P. (*Orientalia Christiana Periodica,* I-II, 1957).

Paul Evergétinos a-t-il connu Syméon le Nouveau Théologien? I. Hausherr, S.J. (*ibid.*).

La christologie de Martyrios-Sahdona dans l'évolution du nestorianisme. A. de Halleux, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

On some recent translations of the Qur'an. A. Bausani (*Numen,* Jan., 1957).

Notes sur le système économique des pays musulmans considéré à travers le Koran. Jean Mehling (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa,* July-Sept., 1957).

Histoire des idées médiévales. Gervais Dumeige (*Recherches de Science Religieuse,* Apr.-June, 1957).

Bulletin d'histoire des doctrines médiévales. J. A. Robilliard, P.M. de Contenson (*Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques,* Jan., 1957).

Scrittura inintelligibile di S. Tommaso e suoi calligrafi. G. F. Rossi, C.M. (*Divus Thomas,* Apr.-June, 1957).

Literature of the Renaissance in 1956: A Bibliography. William Wells, General Editor. (*Studies in Philology,* Apr., 1957).

Neues von der *Theologia Deutsch* und ihrer weltweiten Bedeutung. Georg Baring (*Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* Heft 1, 1957).

Calvin and the Reformation: The Political Education of Protestantism. Sheldon S. Wolin (*American Political Science Review,* June, 1957).

Bibliographia de historia S.J. Ladislao Polgar, S.J. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu,* July-Dec., 1956).

Der Konflikt zwischen Claudius Aquaviva und Paul Hoffaeus. Burkhart Schneider, S.J. (*Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu,* Jan.-June, 1957).

De duabus editionibus Concilii Tridentini. S. Tromp, S.J. (*Gregorianum,* No. 1, 1957).

De manuscriptis acta et declarationes antiquas S. Congregationis Conc. Trid. continentibus. S. Tromp, S.J. (*ibid.,* No. 3, 1957).

El primer Obispo negro de Africa (1518-1534). José Rafael Arboleda, S.J. (*Revista Javeriana,* Apr., 1957).

Der sel. Papst Innocenz XI und die Christen des Nahen Ostens. W. de Vries, S.J. (*Orientalia Christiana Periodica,* I-II, 1957).

Das Schicksal der letzten japanischen Missionäre im 17. Jahrhundert (II). Hub. Cieslik, S.J. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft. Nouvelle Revue de science missionaire,* Heft 2, 1957).

Papal Finance and the Temporal Power, 1815-1871. Rondo E. Cameron (*Church History,* June, 1957).

The Arab Movement, Christianity and Islam Today. William de Vries, S.J. (*Unitas,* Spring, 1957).

The Present State of the Protestant Churches. Louis Bouyer (*Unitas,* Spring, 1957).

Bulletin Historique. Histoire du protestantisme (1939-1952) (5 partie). E. G. Léonard (*Revue Historique,* Apr.-June, 1957).

Orthodoxy, Ecumenical Movement, and Anglicanism: The Moscow Conference of 1948. Richard G. Salomon (*Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church,* June, 1957).

Oecumenism and History. Clement Lialine (*Eastern Churches Quarterly,* Summer, 1957).

L'apostolat des laïcs. Louis C. de Léry, S.J. (*Sciences Ecclésiastiques,* Jan., 1957).

The Church in the Present Century. Eugene J. Jarry (*Thought,* Spring, 1957).

The Metamorphosis of the United Nations. Vernon V. Aspaturian (*Yale Review,* Summer, 1957).

EUROPEAN

La consécration des vierges dans l'Eglise franque du VII^e^ au IX^e^ siècle. R. Metz (*Revue des Sciences Religieuses,* Apr., 1957).

Une décrétale d'Alexandre III en matière de simonie et le chapitre de S. Pierre à Lille. Ch. Lefebure (*Mélanges de Science Religieuse,* May, 1957).

La pauvreté, arme contre l'albigéisme, en 1206. Ch. Thouzellier (*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions,* Jan.-Mar., 1957).

Gersoniana. Max Lieberman (*Romania,* No. 1-2, 1957).

Un aspect de la rivalité franco-espagnole au début du XVIII^e^ siècle (1713-1717). M. Giraud (*Revue Historique,* Apr.-June, 1957).

France and the Revolution: The Abiding Cleavage. John McEwen (*Dublin Review,* Summer, 1957).

The Curés and the Third Estate: The Ideas of Reform in the Pamphlets of the French Lower Clergy in the Period 1787-1789. M. G. Hutt (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1957).

Counter Revolution in Brittany: The Royalist Conspiracy of the Marquis de la Rouërre, 1791-93. A. Goodwin (*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* March, 1957).

Le discours de Chateaubriand au Conclave de 1829. R. Jacquin (*Revue des Sciences Religieuses,* July, 1957).

The Progress of the Church: Recent Developments in France. Lancelot Sheppard (*Dublin Review,* Summer, 1957).

Forms of the Apostolate: The Evolution in France since 1945. John Fitzsimons (*ibid.*).

Years of Change: The Position of the Church in France. Cardinal Feltin (*ibid.*).

Spiritualité française d'aujourd'hui. H. Holstein (*Études,* July-Aug., 1957).

Problemas del cristianismo social francés. Juan Roger (*Razón y Fe,* May, 1957).

France and Europe: The Political Contribution Since 1945. John Dingle (*Dublin Review,* Summer, 1957).

Studi di geolinguistica e protostoria italica. G. Capovilla (*Aevum,* Jan.-Feb., 1957).

La nuova edizione delle opere di S. Bernardino da Siena. G. F. Rossi, C.M. (*Divus Thomas, Commentarium de Philosophia et Theologia,* Apr.-June, 1957).

The Crisis of Renaissance Society Genoa 1488-1507. Paul Coles (*Past & Present,* Apr., 1957).

Saint Charles Borromée, pionnier de la pastorale moderne. R. Mols, S.J. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* June, 1957).

Cavour and Parliament. D. Mack Smith (*Cambridge Historical Journal,* No. 1, 1957).

Thomas Mun in Italy. R. de Roover (*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* May, 1957).

Bibliografía hispánica. Roman Lopez Martinez (*Inter-American Review of Bibliography,* Apr.-June, 1957).

Origenes de culto a San Mateo en España. Ángel Fábrega Grau (*Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia,* Vol. XXIX, 1956).

Las iglesias nacionales de España en Roma. Sus origenes. Justo Fernández Alonso (*Anthologica Annua,* Num. 4, 1956).

La reorganización eclesiástica española del siglo XVI. Aragón-Cataluña. Demetrio Mansilla (*ibid.*).

Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Bericht für das Jahr 1954/55. Friedrich Baethgen (*Deutsches Archiv,* Heft 1, 1957).

Die libri Carolini und ihre Stellung zum Bild. H. Schade (*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie,* Heft 1, 1957).

Die geschichtiche Stellung der mittelalterlichen deutschen Ostbewegung. von W. Schlesinger (*Historische Zeitschrift,* June, 1957).

La littérature polémique autour de la Querelle des Investitures. Le plaidoyer en faveur d'Henri IV de Pierre Crassus (*à suivre*). P. Bonhomme (*Revue des Sciences Religieuses,* July, 1957).

English and French Influences on German Liberalism before 1848. F. Gunther Eyck (*Journal of the History of Ideas,* June, 1957).

Adolf Hitler and the Post-War German Birthrate. An Unpublished Memorandum. Oron J. Hale (*Journal of Central European Affairs,* July, 1957).

Carmelite Art and Architecture in Denmark. Mogens Bencard (*Carmelus,* Fasc. 1, 1957).

Ein ungarischer Bischof in Avignon. K. Juhász (*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie,* Heft 1, 1957).

Geistige Grundlagen der ungarischen Reformzeit, 1790-1848. Béla Menczer (*Der Donauraum,* Heft 1, 1957).

Industrial Development in Bohemia. A. Klima (*Past & Present,* Apr., 1957).

Recent Soviet and Marxist Writings. 1848 in Central and Eastern Europe. John Erickson (*Journal of Central European Affairs,* July, 1957).

BRITISH AND IRISH

Ailred de Rievaulx à l'école des *Confessions.* Pierre Courcelle (*Revue des Études Augustiniennes,* No. 2, 1957).

The Making of Magna Carta. J. C. Holt (*English Historical Review,* July, 1957).

Preference at the Medieval Exchequer. G. L. Harriss (*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* May, 1957).

The English *Greyfriars.* The Use and Survival of the Title in England. John Jukes, O.F.M.Conv. (*Miscellanea Francescana,* Apr.-June, 1957).

The Litigation of an Exempt House, St. Augustine's Canterbury, 1182-1237. Eric John (*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* March, 1957).

A Polish Vernacular Eulogy of Wycliff. Margaret Schlaugh (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1957).

The Work of a Late Fifteenth-Century Scribe, William Ebesham. A. I. Doyle (*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* March, 1957).

Sir Thomas Elyot and the English Reformation. Stanford E. Lehmberg (*Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* Heft 1, 1957).

The Reformation and English Education. Joan Simon (*Past & Present,* Apr., 1957).

The Growth of a Myth. Father Robert Persons, S.J., and Leicester's Commonwealth. Leo Hicks, S.J. (*Studies,* Spring, 1957).

Tudor Expansion: The Transition from Medieval to Modern History. A. L. Rowse (*William and Mary Quarterly,* July, 1957).

The Sale of Peerages in Early Stuart England. Charles R. Mayes (*Journal of Modern History,* Mar., 1957).

The Agitation in the Commons, 2 March 1629, and the Interrogation of the Leaders of the anti-court Group. I. H. C. Fraser (*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* May, 1957).

The Collection for the Indians of New England, 1649-60. William Kellaway (*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* March, 1957).

Booth's Rising in 1659. J. R. Jones (*ibid.*).

Charles II and William of Orange in 1680. J. P. Kenyon (*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* May, 1957).

Some Recent Books in British History: The Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. D. J. McDougall (*Canadian Historical Review,* June, 1957).

English Literature, 1660-1800: A Current Bibliography. G. S. Alleman (*Philological Quarterly,* July, 1956).

The Military Papers of Colonel Samuel Bagshawe (1713-62). James Hayes (*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* Mar., 1957).

Division Lists of the House of Commons, 1714-1760. A. N. Newman (*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* May, 1957).

Colonial Crises before the Cabinet, 1829-1835. Helen Taft Manning (*ibid.*).

The Romantic Movement: A Selective and Critical Bibliography for the Year 1956. Martin K. Nurmi (*Philological Quarterly,* Apr., 1957).

Victorian Bibliography for 1956. Francis G. Townsend (*Modern Philology,* May, 1957).

Lord Salisbury, British Isolation and the Yangtze, June-September, 1900. J. D. Hargreaves (*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* May, 1957).

La conversione e l'apostasia di Giorgio Tyrrell. D. Grasso, S.J. (*Gregorianum,* No. 3, 1957).

Negotiations leading to the Anglo-Polish Agreement of 31 March, 1939, Part II. T. Desmond Williams (*Irish Historical Studies,* Sept., 1956).

On the Character and Achievement of Sir Winston Churchill. Gordon K. Lewis (*Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science,* May, 1957).

Socialist Thought in Great Britain. P. T. Homan (*American Economic Review,* June, 1957).

The Reunion Movement in Scotland. James Douglas (*Unitas,* Spring, 1957).

The Patrician Problem and a Possible Solution. Mario Esposito (*Irish Historical Studies,* Sept., 1956).

Celtic Saints. John Morris (*Past & Present,* Apr., 1957).

Pope Innocent III and the Irish Kings. P. J. Dunning, C.M. (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* Apr., 1957).

Bishop Moriarty on Disestablishment and the Union, 1868. J. H. Whyte (*Irish Historical Studies,* Sept., 1956).

The Great Famine: Legend and Reality. H. F. Kearney (*Studies,* Summer, 1957).

The Sisters of Mercy: An Important Chapter in Church History. Edward A. Ryan, S.J. (*Theological Studies,* June, 1957).

Writings on Irish History, 1955. Esther Semple, Desmond Kennedy, Compiled (*Irish Historical Studies,* Sept., 1956).

Research on Irish History in British and American Universities, 1955-6 (*ibid.*).

Research on Irish History in Irish Universities, 1956-7 (*ibid.*, Mar., 1957).

Source Material for Australian Studies. H. L. White (*Historical Studies, Australia and New Zealand*, May, 1957).

The Federalization of the Australian Cabinet. K. A. MacKirdy (*Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, May, 1957).

The *Catholic Times* (1877-79) and the *Express* (1880-84): Two Catholic Papers printed in New South Wales. Robert A. Daly (*Australasian Catholic Record*, Apr., 1957).

German Settlers in South Australia, 1838-1900. C. A. Price (*Historical Studies, Australia and New Zealand*, May, 1957).

Sir George Gipps and Captain Alexander Maconochie: The Attempted Penal Reforms at Norfolk Islands, 1840-44. S. C. McCulloch (*ibid.*).

AMERICAN

Presidential Inability. Lucius Wilmerding, Jr. (*Political Science Quarterly*, June, 1957).

The Revolution in the Presidential Nominating Convention. William G. Carleton (*ibid.*).

American Catholic Intellectualism—A Theologian's Reflections. Gustave Weigel, S.J. (*Review of Politics*, July, 1957).

On the Nature of Local History. James C. Malin (*Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Summer, 1957).

Early Newspapers of OCALA. Eloise Robinson Ott (*Florida Historical Quarterly*, Apr., 1957).

The Woman Suffrage Movement in Florida. A. Elizabeth Taylor (*ibid.*, July, 1957).

Ulrich B. Phillips: The University of Georgia and The Georgia Historical Society. Wendell H. Stephenson (*Georgia Historical Quarterly*, June, 1957).

Indian River and Place Names in Ohio. August C. Mahr (*Ohio Historical Quarterly*, Apr., 1957).

Frederic G. Young, Regionalist and Historian. George A. Frykman (*Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, Apr., 1957).

The State Archives of Washington. Robert W. Nesbit (*ibid.*).

A Guide to Spanish Source Material. Charles Arnade (*Florida Historical Quarterly*, Apr., 1957).

Birthplaces of the Conquistadors. Karl A. Bickel (*ibid.*, July, 1957).

Spanish Transportation in the Southwest, 1540-1846. Max L. Moorhead (*New Mexico Historical Review*, Apr., 1957).

Portrait of an American Viceroy: Martín Enríquez, 1568-1583. Philip Wayne Powell (*Americas*, July, 1957).

A Social Welfare Organizer in Sixteenth-Century New Spain: Don Vasco de Quiroga, First Bishop of Michoacán. M. M. Lacas (*ibid.*).

The Missionary Activities of Fray Antonio Margil de Jesús in Texas, 1716-1722. William H. Donahue (*ibid.*).

The Anonymous *"Capítulos of 1572"* against Martin Enriquez. Philip Wayne Powell (*ibid.*).

Kent Island, Part I: The Period of Settlement. Erich Isaac (*Maryland Historical Magazine,* June, 1957).

Catholics in Colonial America. John Tracy Ellis (*American Ecclesiastical Review,* Jan.-May, 1957).

Colonial Presbyterianism in the Valley of Virginia, 1727-1775, Part I. Robert F. Scott (*Journal of The Presbyterian Historical Society,* June, 1957).

Natural Law and Manifest Destiny in the Era of the American Revolution. Léon Dion (*Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science,* May, 1957).

War, Profit, and Privateers along the New Jersey Coast: Letters of 1782 Relating to an Obscure Warfront of the American Revolution. Richard J. Koke (*New York Historical Society Quarterly,* July, 1957).

A Surgeon's Mate at Fort Defiance: The Journal of Joseph Gardner Andrews for the Year 1795-II. Richard C. Knopf (*Ohio Historical Quarterly,* Apr., 1957).

The Legacy of John Adams. Clinton Rossiter (*Yale Review,* Summer, 1957).

The Story of the Black Hawk War. Elizabeth B. Rooney (*Wisconsin Magazine of History,* Summer, 1957).

The Removal of the Wyandots from Ohio. Carl G. Klopfenstein (*Ohio Historical Quarterly,* Apr., 1957).

Health Conditions in Indian Territory, 1830 to Civil War. Bernice Norman Crockett (*Chronicles of Oklahoma,* Spring, 1957).

James Buchanan and Public Office: An Appraisal. Robert E. Carlson (*Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography,* July, 1957).

Dred Scott One Hundred Years After. Carl Brent Swisher (*Journal of Politics,* May, 1957).

Sources of Early Antislavery Thought in Illinois. Merton L. Dillon (*Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society,* Spring, 1957).

The Diary of a Union Soldier in Confederate Prisons. James J. Heslin (*New York Historical Society Quarterly,* July, 1957).

Marching Through South Carolina: Another Civil War Letter of Lieutenant George M. Wise. Wilfred W. Black (*Ohio Historical Quarterly,* Apr., 1957).

Lincoln and the Mayor of Chicago. Don E. Fehrenbacher (*Wisconsin Magazine of History,* Summer, 1957).

Lewis Cass, Jr. and Pope Pius IX, 1850-58. Sexson E. Humphreys (*Michigan History,* June, 1957).

Story of a Magazine: New York's *Galaxy* 1866-1878. Justus R. Pearson, Jr. (*Bulletin of the New York Public Library,* May, 1957).

Jewish Immigrant Life in Philadelphia, 1890. Louis Edward Levy (*American Jewish Archives,* Apr., 1957).

Woodrow Wilson as a Young Lawyer, 1882-1883. George C. Osborn (*Georgia Historical Quarterly,* June, 1957).

The Attitude of the Catholic Press toward the League of Nations. Mary Misaela Zacharewicz, C.S.F.N. (*Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia,* June-Sept.-Dec., 1956).

Writings in U. S. Church History for 1956. E. R. Vollmar (*Manuscripta*, July, 1957).

Le Québec et les migrations interrégionales au Canada. Lionel Laberge (*Culture*, June, 1957).

Inventaire critique des notaires royaux des gouvernements de Québec, Montréal et Trois-Rivières (1663-1764) (suite). André Vachon (*Revue d'Histoire de l'Amérique Française*, June, 1957).

Les missions catholiques dans l'Est du Canada et l'Honorable Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson (suite). Gaston Carrière, O.M.I. (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, July-Sept., 1957).

Un *quarante-huitard* du Risorgimento au Canada (suite). Robert Sylvain (*La Revue de l'Université Laval*, June, 1957).

Les divers motifs qui ont amené Saint-Sulpice à Montréal. Olivier Maurault (*Revue d'Histoire de l'Amérique Française*, June, 1957).

Le Canadien and the British Constitution, 1806-1810. Lawrence A. H. Smith (*Canadian Historical Review*, June, 1957).

The Decline of Shipbuilding at Quebec in the Nineteenth Century. Albert Faucher (*Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, May, 1957).

Problems of Mexican Ethno-History: The Ancient Chinantla. Howard F. Cline (*Hispanic American Historical Review*, Aug., 1957).

Dos Concepcionistas nietas de Moteczuma. Madelena Sáez Pomés (*Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia*, Vol. XXIX, 1956).

Two Lost Mexican Books of the Sixteenth Century. Ernest J. Burrus, S.J. (*Hispanic American Historical Review*, Aug., 1957).

British Reaction to the Cuban Insurrection of 1868-1878. Christopher J. Bartlett (*ibid.*).

Die Sklaverei in Marahão-Brasilien im 17. Jahrhundert (I). Benno Biermann, O.P. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft. Nouvelle Revue de science missionnaire*, Heft 2, 1957).

Participación del Perú en la libertad de América. Rubén Vargas Ugarte (*Revista de Historia de América*, Dec., 1956).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Adam, Karl. *The Christ of Faith. The Christology of the Church.* Translated from German by Joyce Crick. (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc. 1957. Pp. x, 364. $6.00.)

Beckman, Peter, O.S.B. *Kansas Monks. A History of St. Benedict's Abbey.* (Atchison: Abbey Student Press. 1957. Pp. 362. $5.00.)

Benedictines of Stanbrook. *In a Great Tradition. Tribute to Dame Laurentia McLachlan, Abbess of Stanbrook.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1957. Pp. viii, 312. $5.00.)

Biro, Sydney Seymour. *The German Policy of Revolutionary France. A Study in French Diplomacy During the War of the First Coalition, 1792-1797.* 2 vols. (Pp. xvi, 480; pp. ix, 1104. $15.00.)

Bonser, Wilfrid. *An Anglo Saxon and Celtic Bibliography (450-1087). Anglo Saxon Bibliography Indices.* 2 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957. Pp. xxxvii, 574; pp. 123. $18.50.)

Burghardt, Walter J., S.J. *The Image of God in Man. According to Cyril of Alexandria.* This volume by the managing editor of *Theological Studies* is No. 14 in the series Studies in Christian Antiquity edited by Johannes Quasten. (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press. 1957. Pp. xvi, 194. $3.00.)

Burton, Katherine. *The Golden Door. The Life of Katharine Drexel.* (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1957. Pp. xi, 329. $3.75.)

Caraman, Philip. *Henry Morse: Priest of the Plague.* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy. 1957. Pp. xi, 201. $3.75.)

Cary-Elwes, Columba, O.S.B. *China and the Cross. A Survey of Missionary History.* (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1957. Pp. xii, 323. $3.95.)

Castelot, André. *Queen of France. A Biography of Marie Antoinette.* Translated by Denise Folliot. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1957. Pp. ix, 434. $5.00.)

Chadwick, Owen. *From Bossuet to Newman. The Idea of Doctrinal Development. The Birkbeck Lectures 1955-56.* (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1957. Pp. x, 249.)

Cochrane, Charles Norris. *Christianity and Classical Culture. A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1957. Pp. vii, 523. $2.95.)

de Leturia, Pedro, S.J. *Estudios Ignacianos,* Revisados por el P. Ignacio Iparraguirre, S.J. Volume I, *Estudios Biograficos;* II. *Estudios Espirituales.* (Rome: Bibliotheca Instituti Historici, S.J. Pp. xxxii, 475; viii, 544.)

Davis, R. H. C. *A History of Medieval Europe. From Constantine to Saint Louis.* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Inc. 1957. Pp. xiii, 421. $5.00.)

Denholm-Young, N. Translator. John Walwayn, Editor. *The Life of Edward the Second by the So-called Monk of Malmesbury. Vita Edwardi Secundi.* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957. Pp. xxviii, 150. $4.00.)

Department of State. *United States Policy in the Middle East, September, 1957-June, 1957.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1957. Pp. xiv, 425. $1.50.)

De Wohl, Louis. *The Glorious Folly. A Novel of the Days of St. Paul.* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1957. Pp. 384, $3.95.)

Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918-1945. Series D (1937-1945). Volume X. *The War Years, June 23-August 31, 1940.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1957. Pp. lvi, 615. $2.75.)

Duggan, Alfred. *Devil's Brood. The Angevin Family.* (London: Faber & Faber, Ltd., 1957. Pp. 278. 21s net.)

Edwards, R. Dudley and T. Desmond Williams (Eds.). *The Great Famine.* (New York: New York University Press. 1957. Pp. xvi, 517. $6.00.)

Ellis, David M., James A. Frost, Harold C. Syrett and Harry F. Carman. *A Short History of New York State. Book I, 1609-1865.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1957. Pp. xiii, 705. $7.75.)

Ennis, Arthur, O.S.A. *Fray Alonso de la Vera Cruz, O.S.A. (1507-1584). A Study of His Life and His Contribution to the Religious and Intellectual Affairs of Early Mexico.* (Louvain: Imprimerie E. Warny, 1957. Pp. viii, 210.)

Feis, Herbert. *Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin. The War They Waged and the Peace They Sought.* A diplomatic history of World War II. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957. Pp. xi, 692. $6.95.)

Frame, Donald M. Translator. *The Complete Works of Montaigne.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957. Pp. xxvi, 1093. $12.50.)

Gershoy, Leo. *The Era of the French Revolution, 1789-1799. Ten Years that Shook the World.* (An Anvil Original No. 22.) (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc. 1957. Pp. 192. $1.25.)

Gibb, H. A. R. and Harold Bowen. *Islamic Society and the West. A Study of the Impact of Western Civilization on Moslem Culture in the Near East.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1957. Pp. v, 285. $5.60.)

Glazer, Nathan. *American Judaism.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1957. Pp. xi, 175. $3.50.)

Green, Constance McLaughlin. *American Cities in the Growth of the Nation.* (New York: John De Graf. 1957. Pp. xii, 258. $6.50.)

Hacker, Louis M. *American Capitalism. Its Promise and Accomplishment.* (An Anvil Original No. 20.) (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc. 1957. Pp. 192. $1.25.)

Harper, Josephine L. and Sharon Smith. *Guide to Manuscripts.* Supplement No. 1. (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin. 1957. Pp. vii, 222. $5.00.)

Huot-Pleuroux, Paul. *Histoire de la Musique Religieuse.* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 1957. Pp. viii, 455. 1500 f. and T.L.)

Kai-shek, Chiang. *Soviet Russia in China. A Summing-up at Seventy.* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy. 1957. Pp. 392. $5.00.) This volume recounts in full the story of China's role in the modern world from the beginning of Sun Yat-Sen's revolution of 1911 to December, 1956. Chiang Kai-Shek gives his personal estimate of prominent Americans such as Generals Stilwell, Wedemeyer, Marshall, and Patrick Hurley and the part they played in his country's recent history. The author states in the introduction: "It is my earnest hope that the bitter lessons China has learned may prove instructive to countries and governments, and especially those in Asia which now face the same threat of Communism" (p. 7).

Keleher, William A. *Violence in Lincoln County, 1869-1881.* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. 1957. Pp. xvi, 390. $6.00.)

Kennedy, Gail, Ed. *Evolution and Religion. The Conflict Between Science and Theology in Modern America.* (Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1957. Pp. xii, 114.)

Kittler, Glenn D. *The White Fathers.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1957. Pp. xv, 299. $5.00.)

Knowles, M.D. *Cardinal Gasquet as an Historian.* (London: University of London, The Athlone Press. 1957. Pp. 26. 3s6d.)

Kohn, Hans. *American Nationalism. An Interpretative Essay.* (New York: MacMillan Co. 1957. Pp. xi, 272. $5.00.)

———, *Basic History of Modern Russia. Political, Cultural, and Social Trends.* (An Anvil Original No. 24.) (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc. 1957. Pp. 192. $1.25.)

Kowalsky, Nikolaus, O.M.I. *Stand der katholischen Missionen um das Jahr 1765, an Hand der Uebersicht des Propagandasekretars, Stefano Borgia aus dem Jahre, 1773.* (Schoeneck/Beckenried(Schweiz): Administration der Neuen Zeitschrift fur Missionswissenschaft. 1957. Sfrs. 5,40.)

Landerholm, Carl (Trans. and Ed.). *Notices and Voyages of the Famed Quebec Mission to the Pacific Northwest.* (Portland: Oregon Historical Society. 1956. Pp. iv, 243. $12.50.)

Lekai, Louis J., S.O.Cist. *Les Moines Blancs. Histoire de l'Ordre Cistercien.* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil. 1957. Pp. 370.) The original version of this volume was reviewed in our journal in January, 1954 (Pp. 435-436). Father Lekai of the University of Dallas has now rendered it into French which will be a service to those who do not read English; the book is an able and balanced survey that will be of assistance to all students of religious history.

Levasti, Arrigo (Ed.). *Beato Giovanni Dominici, O.P. Trattato delle dieci questioni E. Lettere a Madonna Bartolomea.* (Firenze: Libreria Editrice Fiorentina. 1957. Pp. 154. L. 950.) In addition to the Dominici texts the editor has provided a general introduction and notes.

Lewis, D. B. Wyndham. *Doctor Rabelais.* (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1957. Pp. 274. $4.00.)

Lucey, William Leo, S.J. *The Catholic Church in Maine.* (Francestown, New Hampshire: Marshall Jones Co. 1957. Pp. xiv, 372. $3.95.)

MacKinney, Loren C. *Bishop Fulbert and Education at The School of Chartres.* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1957. Pp. 60.)

McDonald, M. Grace, O.S.B. *With Lamps Burning.* (Saint Joseph: Saint Benedict's Priory Press. 1957. Pp. 329.)

McKeon, Richard, Robert K. Merton and Walter Gellhorn. *The Freedom to Read. Perspective and Program.* (New York: R. R. Bowker Co. for The National Book Committee, Inc. 1957. Pp. xvii, 110. $2.50.)

McSorley, Joseph, C.S.P. *Common Sense.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1957. Pp. viii, 136. $2.75.)

Maine, René. *Trafalgar, Napoleon's Naval Waterloo.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1957. Pp. viii, 261. $4.50.)

Majdalany, Fred. *The Battle of Cassino.* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1957. Pp. viii, 309. $4.00.)

Menon, V. P. *The Transfer of Power in India.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1957. Pp. 543. $8.50.)

Meyer, Franz Sales. *Handbook of Ornament.* An unabridged and unaltered reprint of the English translation of the last revised edition. (New York: Dover Publications, Inc. 1957. Pp. xiv, 548. $2.00.)

Meylan, Henri (Préface). *Aspects de la Propagande Religieuse.* (Genève: Librairie E. Droz. 1957. Pp. xviii, 427. 60 fr.s.)

Moreland, W. H. and Atul Chandra Chatterjee. *A Short History of India.* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Inc. 1957. Pp. xii, 594. $6.00.)

Mould, Daphne O. C. Pochin. *The Celtic Saints.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1956. Pp. 160. $3.75.)

Mourret, Fernand, S.S. *History of the Catholic Church.* Volume VIII. *Period of the Early Nineteenth Century (1823-1878).* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1957. Pp. xiii, 807. $11.00.)

Muller, Herbert J. *The Uses of the Past. Profiles of Former Societies.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1957. Pp. xi, 394. $2.25.)

Nevins, Allan and Frank Ernest Hill. Research associates: William Greenleaf and George B. Heliker. *Ford: Expansion and Challenge, 1915-1933.* This is a continuation of the authors' *Ford: The Times, The Company* which appeared in 1954. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1957. Pp. xviii, 714. $8.95.)

O'Donohoe, James A. *Tridentine Seminary Legislation. Its Sources and Its Formation.* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain. 1957. Pp. vi, 187.)

Pearson, Lu Emily. *Elizabethans At Home.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1957. Pp. 630. $8.75.)

Pegis, Anton C. (Ed.). *A Gilson Reader. Selected Writings of Etienne Gilson.* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc. Image D55. Pp. 358. $3.50 cloth; 95¢ paper.)

Porrúa, Manuel. *Catalogo de Libros de Ocasion No. 6.* (Mexico: Libreria de Manuel Porrúa, S.A., 1957. Pp. 214.)

Portmann, Heinrich. Translated, adapted and introduction by R. L. Sedgwick. *Cardinal von Galen.* (London: Jarrolds Publishers, Ltd. 1957. Pp. 255. 21 s.)

Powell, John Wesley. *The Exploration of the Colorado River.* Abridged from the First Edition of 1875 with an introduction by Wallace Stegner. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1957. Pp. xxi, 138. $3.75). It was in 1869 that Powell, a one-armed veteran of the Battle of Shilo, began his exploration of the Colorado. His journal furnished a vivid account of his experiences. Powell had taught geology at Illinois Wesleyan University, became founder and first director of the Bureau of Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution, and in 1881 was named director of the United States Geographical Survey. The present edition carries a number of illustrations.

Proceedings of the Presentation of The Williamsburg Award. By the Trustees of Colonial Williamsburg to the Right Honorable Sir Winston S. Churchill at Drapers' Hall, London, December 7, 1955. (Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg. Pp. 48.)

Public Archives of Canada. *Manuscript Group 23— Late 18th Century Papers Preliminary Inventory.* (Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier. 1957. Pp. 52. 50¢.)

Report of a Study Group set up by the Indian Council of World Affairs. *India and the United Nations.* (New York: Manhattan Publishing Co. 1957. Pp. xi, 229. $3.00.) This volume is one in the series entitled National Studies on International Organization initiated by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Reynolds, E. E. (Ed.). *The Mawhood Diary. Selections from the diary notebooks of William Mawhood, woolen-draper of London, for the years 1764-1790.* (London: Catholic Record Society. 1957. Pp. 291.)

Rezsohazy, Rudolf. *Histoire du Mouvement Mutualiste Chrètien en Belgique.* (Brussels: Alliance Nationale des Mutualites Chretiennes, Landsbond der Kristelijke Mutualiteiten. 1957. Pp. 344.)

Robinson, C. A., Jr. (Ed.). *Selections from Greek and Roman Historians.* (New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc. 1957. Pp. xl, 341. $1.25.) (Rinehart Editions 88.) A good selection of representative passages in the best English translations from the ancient Greek and Roman historians, beginning with Herodotus and closing with Tacitus and Suetonius. The introduction, if a bit exuberant in style, is quite satisfactory. Unfortunately, there is no index.

Roys, Ralph L. *The Political Geography of the Yucatan Maya.* (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1957. [Publication 613.] Pp. iv, 187. $2.00, cloth; $1.60, paper.) This is an investigation of the sixteen independent Maya states of Yucatan at the time of the Spanish conquest in 1542. The boundaries and most of the towns of these states have been mapped and described, and a study has been made of economic and political conditions wherever possible. Nearly all the rulers have been identified, and for a large number of towns it has been possible to ascertain the names of the more powerful and influential families. Much attention is paid to the patronymics of the rulers and to the distribution of the so-called lineages, or name groups, among the various states. Although local government was about the same everywhere, there were three different kinds of territorial government in Yucatan which are here examined and described.

Rudkin, Charles N. (Ed.). *Observations on California, 1772-1790 by Father Luis Sales, O.P. Early California Travel Series, XXXVII.* (Los Angeles: Glen Dawson. 1956. Pp. xiii, 218. $10.00.)

Schmidt, George P. *The Liberal Arts College. A Chapter in American Cultural History.* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1957. Pp. viii, 310. $6.00.)

Schuman, Frederick L. *Russia Since 1917.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1957. Pp. xv, 508, xxvii. $6.50.)

Schütte, Johannes, S.V.D. *Die Katholische China Mission im Spiegel der Rotchinesischen Presse. Versuch einer Missionarischen Deutung.* (Münster: Achendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Pp. xli, 394. DM, kart. 29.50.)

Shaw, J. G. *Edwin Vincent O'Hara. American Prelate. A Biography.* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy. 1957. Pp. xiii, 274. $4.00.)

Shklar, Judith N. *After Utopia. The Decline of Political Faith.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1957. Pp. x, 309. $5.00.)

Small, Harold Adams (Ed.). *The Road to Richmond. The Civil War Memoirs of Maj. Abner R. Small of the 16th Maine Vols.; With His Diary as a Prisoner of War.* (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1957. Pp. xi, 260. $1.50.)

Smith, Wilfred Cantwell. *Islam in Modern History.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1957. Pp. ix, 317. $6.00.)

Snell, John L. (Ed.). *The Meaning of Yalta. Big Three Diplomacy and the New Balance of Power.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1957. Pp. xiii, 239. $3.75.) The six essays of this volume have been written by four historians who are specialists in one or other of the areas treated at Yalta. Professor Paul H. Clyde of Duke University writes a foreword and the whole has been edited by John L. Snell of Tulane University.

Snyder, Louis L. *Basic History of Modern Germany.* (An Anvil Original No. 2.) (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc. 1957. Pp. 192. $1.25.)

Stanford, Derek and Muriel Spark. *Letters of John Henry Newman.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1957. Pp. 251. $4.00.)

Taylor, Jerome. *The Origin and Early Life of Hugh of St. Victor: An Evaluation of the Tradition.* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1957. Pp. 70.)

Treadgold, Donald W. *The Great Siberian Migration. Government and Peasant in Resettlement from Emancipation to the First World War.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1957. Pp. xiii, 278. $5.00.) The sub-title describes this work by the associate professor of Russian history in the University of Washington. Professor Michael Karpovich of Harvard University states that the book "deals in a scholarly and interesting fashion with a subject of great importance to all students of Russian history . . . The value of Professor Treadgold's contribution is enhanced by the fact that he has paid due attention to some more general problems common to all frontier regions."

Underwood, Kenneth Wilson. *Protestant and Catholic. Religious and Social Interaction in an Industrial Community.* (Boston: The Beacon Press. 1957. Pp. xxi, 484. $6.00.)

Weiner, Myron. *Party Politics in India. The Development of a Multi-Party System.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1957. Pp. xiii, 319. $5.00.)

Williams, Margaret, R.S.C.J. *The Sacred Heart in the Life of the Church.* (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1957. Pp. vlii, 248. $3.75.)

Williamson, Hugh Ross. *Beginning of the English Reformation.* (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1957. Pp. 113. $2.50.)